

DT
31
B82 E5

U.S.S.R. ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
Institute of Africa

M. BRAGINSKY

AFRICA WINS FREEDOM

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
Moscow

PRINTED IN SOVIET UNION
MOSKVA 1974

4833

Moisei Braginsky is a researcher at the Africa Institute of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences.

The book popularly describes the political, economic and social changes which have taken place in Africa in the post-war years and deals with the main phases of the African nations' fight for independence.

The author paints a broad picture of the national liberation movement in Africa and devotes a whole chapter to the African peoples' struggle to root out colonialism and its consequences.

Considerable space is given to illustrate the Soviet Union's manifold assistance and support to the newly-independent African states.

15/170

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN
BY G. IVANOV-MUMJIEV

DESIGNED BY G. CHEKOVSKY

UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	5
<i>Chapter I. Grounds for the Revolution</i>	9
<i>Chapter II. Abolition of the Colonial Regime in North Africa and the Sudan</i>	25
Liberation of the Nile Valley	25
Morocco and Tunisia Achieve Independence . .	32
The Algerian People's Victory	37
<i>Chapter III. Tropical Africa Smashes Colonial Chains</i>	47
<i>Chapter IV. New Independent States</i>	74
Growing African Solidarity	74
Disintegration of the French Community . .	76
The Congo Lessons	85
Abolition of Colonial Regimes in Nigeria and Sierra Leone	103
New Independent States in East Africa	105
<i>Chapter V. The Struggle Colonialism Continues</i> .	133
The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland .	134
The Portuguese Colonies	147
South Africa	155
<i>Chapter VI. Towards Regeneration</i>	162

171835
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

2571835

PREFACE

On December 9, 1961, the day Tanganyika proclaimed her independence, a torch was lit on Kilimanjaro, the highest mountain in Africa. This flaming torch on the roof of Africa symbolises the liberation not only of Tanganyika but of the whole of the continent from colonial and imperialist rule.

Africa came into the limelight in the 1950's. "Africa in Flames", "Liberation Hurricane Sweeps Africa", "Africa Smashes the Chains of Colonialism"—such were the newspaper headlines illustrating the events unfolding on the Dark Continent.

The disintegration and collapse of the colonial system, that part and parcel of the general crisis of capitalism, is one of the most important post-war developments.

Some 1,500 million people, almost half the globe's population, have freed themselves from colonial slavery since the end of the war. In Asia, the colonial system began to disintegrate immediately after the Second World War. In Africa, these were the years of unprecedented upsurge in the national liberation movement, culminating in the emergence of a number of independent states in the mid-fifties. There were only five independent African states (25 per cent of the continent's population) before 1955. The advent of the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism brought in its wake the abolition of colonial regimes in many countries. Twenty-two independent states came into existence in the five years ending 1960. More than 100 million people in North and Tropical Africa broke out of the hated colonial chains. By the end of 1960 there were already 27 independent states with an aggregate population amounting to 75 per cent of the continent's total. Two more countries—Sierra Leone and

Tanganyika—acquired political independence in 1961, four—Algeria, Ruanda, Burundi and Uganda—by the end of 1962, and Kenya and Zanzibar by the end of 1963.

The defenders of imperialism seek to persuade world public opinion that the African countries owe their independence to the policy pursued by the colonial powers. On December 17, 1960, after the U.N. General Assembly had adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples, one of the leading American dailies, the *New York Times*, wrote: "The West could point out with pride that it had been carrying out the principles of this resolution long before it was passed by freeing nearly two score now independent states with 800 million people." An assertion of this sort is plain falsification of history.

The anti-imperialist revolutions taking place in Africa are due to many closely interlinked factors: the weakening of the world capitalist system as a result of the Second World War, the emergence and consolidation of the world socialist system, and the socio-economic changes in the African countries. The collapse of the colonial system is a law-governed phenomenon of our age, an age whose main landmark is transition from capitalism to socialism.

In their development, the anti-imperialist national liberation revolutions pass through a number of stages. The first is the struggle to end the political domination of the imperialist powers and achieve independence. The abolition of the colonial regime in itself does not mean an end to colonialism as a system subordinating the underdeveloped countries to imperialism. To become really independent the young African states have complicated problems to solve in carrying out socio-economic reforms. This cannot be done without a struggle against the imperialist powers' attempts to subordinate the newly-independent states with the aid of neo-colonialist methods.

"A national liberation revolution does not end with the winning of political independence," says the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. "Independence will be unstable and will become fictitious unless the revolution brings about radical changes in the social

and economic spheres and solves the pressing problems of national rebirth."

Most of the African countries have already gone through the first stage of the national anti-imperialist revolution, but the colonial regime has not been fully abolished. The British, French, Portuguese and Spanish imperialists are making desperate efforts to preserve their rule in the colonies. No one doubts, however, that the colonial system of imperialism is in its death throes and that the day is not far off when this disgraceful page will be torn out of human history.

Chapter I

GROUNDS FOR THE REVOLUTION

Together with the islands, Africa—the world's second biggest continent—occupies 23 per cent of the total land area (upwards of 30,000,000 square kilometres) and accounts for 8 per cent of the total population (more than 250,000,000). The peoples of Africa, once boasting of a rich and original culture, have dropped behind many other nations socially and economically as a result of historical developments. Vast devastation and damage to the continent were wrought by slave trade, conducted by the Europeans and the Americans in the 16th-19th centuries. One Liverpool trading company alone had 878 slave ships in 1783-93. William E. B. Du Bois, the well-known American historian, estimates Africa's total losses from slave trade at 100,000,000 people. Karl Marx wrote in *Capital* that slave trade had turned Africa into a "warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins". Exports of slaves ceased in the 19th century because the colonialists found that they could use the Africans as slave labourers on the spot.

The defenders of colonialism go all out to prove that it was a progressive development in the history of the underdeveloped African nations. Prof. Rupert Emerson of Harvard University writes, for instance, that colonialism was the channel through which the knowledge and the theoretical habits of the West became the property of the African peoples.

No one will deny that the establishment of mining and processing industries, the construction of railways and ports, the introduction of new crops and expansion of commodity production were objectively progressive developments. But all this was done in the interest of the foreign monopolies for which Africa was a virtual gold

mine. The economic development of the African countries was monstrously lopsided. The growth of the productive forces was stumped and the only branches of industry promoted were the ones the monopolies wanted. The result was Africa's transformation into an agrarian and raw-material appendage of the imperialist powers.

The expansion of industrial and agricultural output caused by these powers' penetration into the continent did nothing to improve the lot of the indigenous population. The British colonialists have written a great deal about the considerable progress achieved by Tanganyika in 1947-56. They stress, among other things, that cotton yields in this decade increased 232 per cent and diamond output all of 289 per cent. Did this entail higher living standards for the Africans? This question is answered to a certain extent by the data on national incomes. Let us compare per capita annual incomes in Britain and Tanganyika for 1952-57. In Britain it rose from £252 6s 8d to £342 2s 0d, and in Tanganyika from £16 4s 0d to £16 10s 0d, that is, it remained practically unchanged at its extremely low level. What is more, average figures do not always reflect the true state of affairs. In its report to the Trusteeship Council, the U.N. mission which visited Tanganyika in 1957 said that although the annual per capita income was £16 10s 0d, the annual average for the Europeans was £400 and for the Africans only £8. Considering that living costs in Tanganyika in these years had increased substantially, the conclusion was that the material position of the Africans had grown worse rather than better.

The Africans' earnings are even below the official living wage. In 1956 Tanganyikan farm labourers made between 18 and 40 shillings a month and miners between 30 and 68 shillings. Just how little this is may be seen from the prices of certain foodstuffs in Dar-es-Salaam: a pound of meat cost from 1s 3d to 4s 0d, a pound of coconut oil 1s 4d, a pound of beans over 5d. Small wonder that a worker's diet consisted of maize, beans and other vegetables.

Worst hit by colonialism were the peasants, the bulk of Africa's population. The best lands were seized by European companies and settlers.

The French colonialists in North Africa particularly excelled in land seizure. In Algeria, according to 1954 statistics, 25,000 Frenchmen owned 2,700,000 hectares of the most fertile land, with 900 of them accounting for 1,000,000 hectares. On the average, the French settlers' holdings came to 100 hectares. At the same time, 3,000,000 Algerians had no land at all and made a living either as sharecroppers or farmhands.

In Tunisia, in 1950, European settlers and French joint-stock real estate companies owned 760,000 hectares of the best land, or about one-fifth of the cultivated area. More than half of the local population were either farm labourers or tenant farmers paying as much as 75-80 per cent of their crop to the landowners.

In Morocco, 5,500 European settlers owned more than 1,000,000 hectares of land, or an average of 180 hectares each. The 700,000 Moroccan sharecroppers, on the other hand, were allowed to retain only 20 per cent of the crop for their exhausting labour.

The land area at the disposal of European farms and timber and mining concerns in Madagascar in 1951 exceeded 3,000,000 hectares.

A similar policy of plunder was pursued by the British colonialists. In Southern Rhodesia in 1957, for instance, the 14,000 or 15,000 European farmers owned 31,700,000 acres (acre=0.404 hectare) of land, while the 2,300,000 Africans, driven into reservations, had to be content with 20,800,000 acres. This means 2,000 acres per European and only nine acres per African.

In Kenya, the European settlers were allotted the most fertile soil in the White Highlands. The Africans living there were deprived of their lawful right to land and driven into crowded reservations. The European planters were in need of cheap manpower and the Africans, robbed of their land, had no way out but to work for them. Statistics for 1955 reveal that the European farmers had on the average 861 hectares of land each, while the Africans disposed of only 2.2 hectares each.

Colonial rule thus dispossessed the African peasants of their land and considerably worsened their material position.

In their drive to turn the colonies into a source of cheap agricultural raw materials, the imperialist powers encouraged European plantations to grow exportable crops. The African economy gradually became one-sided. Ghana, for instance, grew and exported chiefly cocoa, Senegal—groundnuts, the Sudan and Uganda—cotton, Angola—coffee, etc. The expansion of the area under export crops led to a decrease in the output of other food-stuffs, and this made the African countries more dependent still on food imports.

The African peasants who cultivated export crops were fully dependent on the foreign monopolies which bought up agricultural raw materials at extremely low prices. Take the Belgian Congo, for instance. In 1952 its 826,000 peasants grew 158,300 tons of cotton for which they were paid only four francs per kilogramme, although the world market price was fifteen.

The prices of the export crops grown in Africa—coffee, cocoa, sisal, cotton, groundnuts, bananas, etc.—dropped substantially in 1955-59. This caused the countries of Tropical Africa to lose \$600 million, or twice the amount given Africa by the capitalist states in the form of loans and other aid in 1961.

Working conditions in the African colonies are the worst in the world. Forced labour is still practised in the Portuguese possessions. Labour Regulations for Mozambique Natives prohibit African workers to demand wage increases or walk out while the contract is in force. Movement outside specified territory is prohibited.

Racial discrimination in Africa led to a huge difference in the remuneration of Europeans and Africans. In the Congo, in 1954, a European worker earned forty times as much as an African. In Northern Rhodesia, a European bricklayer is paid 11s an hour and his African colleague one shilling threepence halfpenny. In Kenya, Europeans earn on the average £1,060, Asian settlers £456 and Africans £56 a year.

The exploitation of African manpower is a source of fabulous profits for foreign entrepreneurs. The national income of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland in 1957 reached £325,600,000. Of this sum, £79,000,000 (24.2 per cent) went in wages to the Africans and £135,500,000

(41.6 per cent) in profit to private and state firms. In that same year the national income of the Belgian Congo was 49,530,000,000 francs and 46 per cent of it went to the European population who constitute 4 per cent of the total. The ratio between European and African average annual incomes was 63:1.

The economic plunder of the continent and the ruthless exploitation of its population were attended by brutal political oppression. The colonialists treated the Africans as a second-rate race, deprived them of elementary rights, barred them from public and political affairs.

Bourgeois authors often claim that European conquests in Africa brought enlightenment in their wake. The figures given below show how utterly groundless these claims are. Ninety per cent of the African population can neither read nor write. According to U.N. data for 1957, only 5 per cent of children went to primary school in Northern Nigeria, 12 per cent in Sierra Leone, 21 per cent in Tanganyika. In the French Sudan the figure for 1953 was only 1 per cent. It is still harder for an African to acquire secondary education, to say nothing of higher. A very limited number of children go through the full course of secondary school.

The *Manchester Guardian* wrote on July 15, 1959, that only 0.025 per cent of children went to secondary school in Northern Nigeria, 0.27 per cent in Eastern Nigeria and Sierra Leone, 0.06 per cent in Uganda, 0.07 per cent in Kenya, 0.04 per cent in Tanganyika, and 0.05 per cent in Nyasaland.

Medical services also belie the claims about the colonialists' civilising mission. Usually there were doctors only in the bigger towns and industrial centres. In the Belgian Congo in 1954 there was one doctor per 20,000 of the population, in French Equatorial Africa per 23,000, in French West Africa per 29,000, in Gambia per 30,000, in Nyasaland per 32,000, and in Nigeria per 56,000. Small wonder, then, that the death rate in Africa was the highest in the world. On his return from a fact-finding mission in the Portuguese colonies in 1947, Henrique Galvão, then a deputy of the National Assembly, reported to Salazar that there was no public health service as such

for the indigenous population in Portuguese Guinea, Angola and Mozambique, that child mortality there reached 60 per cent and the death rate among the workers 40 per cent.

In short, it was not progress and civilisation that imperialist rule brought Africa, as the colonialists allege, but savage economic, political and cultural oppression. That explains the African peoples' determination to free themselves from the colonialists and ensure their countries' genuine progress and free development.

The tempestuous upswing in the African national liberation movement in the latter part of the 1950's was due to many political factors, internal and external. The rout of the fascist bloc in the Second World War, the decline of the world capitalist system and the emergence of the world socialist system in the post-war years created exceptionally favourable conditions for the independence struggle. Almost all the Asian countries won freedom soon after the war and this proved to be an inspiring example to the African peoples in their struggle against the colonialists.

The existence of the mighty socialist camp greatly facilitates the colonial people's fight for independence. In the past, the imperialist powers could use all their military strength to quash risings in the countries they had enslaved without fearing any consequences. Today, in the new historical conditions, the oppressed nations in their just struggle can rely on real assistance from socialist countries and not only on their moral support and sympathies. Take, for instance, the Anglo-French imperialists' attempt to restore their privileges in Egypt by armed force in 1956: it failed ignominiously thanks to the resolute stand of the Soviet Union and its warning that it was prepared to support the Egyptian people's lawful demands.

The favourable international climate accelerated the development and growth of the revolutionary forces in Africa.

Major socio-economic changes began to take shape in the African colonies in the war years. Disruption of old international economic ties caused a sharp reduction in the imports of industrial goods and foodstuffs. This led

to the expansion of certain branches in the manufacturing industry and to the appearance of new sawmills, oil mills, meat-packing plants, sugar refineries, garment, footwear, soap, cigarette and other factories.

The belligerents' acute need of strategic war materials helped promote the mining industry and considerably increase the output of diamonds, chromium, manganese, bauxites, tin, uranium and other minerals. Despite this industrial growth in the war years, the African colonies remained what they were—agrarian and raw-material appendages of the metropolitan countries.

Africa's role in the world economy grew substantially after the war. The withdrawal of several East European countries from the world capitalist system and the abolition of the colonial regime in Asian countries compelled the capitalist powers to seek for new sources of mineral and agricultural raw materials in Africa. Agricultural output on this continent in 1956-57 was 54 per cent above the prewar, whereas the overall figure for the world was only 37. French West Africa grew one and a half times as many groundnuts in 1957 as before the war, Angola, the Belgian Congo, Ethiopia, Uganda, Kenya, Tanganyika and French West Africa four and a half times as much coffee, and the Sudan, Nigeria, Uganda and Tanganyika twice as much cotton.

Tangible changes have taken place since the war in the mining industry, which is operated almost entirely by the foreign monopolies. By 1957 the output of copper ore in the Belgian Congo and Northern Rhodesia had increased 1.7 times, the output of chromium in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Sierra Leone 3.6 times, the output of cobalt in the Belgian Congo and Northern Rhodesia 2.6 times, the output of diamonds in the Belgian Congo, on the Gold Coast, in Sierra Leone, Southwest Africa and Tanganyika 2.2 times.

Further expansion was registered in the manufacturing industry, especially in the branches processing local agricultural raw materials. The new enterprises included textile mills, sugar refineries, breweries, ginneries and cigarette factories.

The post-war economic progress in Africa was accompanied by the growth of new social forces: the working

class became more numerous and better organised, the bourgeoisie began to play a bigger role in the colonies' economy and politics.

The economic development of the African countries is distinguished by the fact that the capitalist mode of production is the result of foreign monopoly penetration and the inclusion of the colonies in the world capitalist market. In Africa capitalism developed on the basis of foreign and not national capital. This explains the unique situation where, with no or practically no national industrial bourgeoisie, there is a numerous working class employed on plantations, in foreign-run factories and mills and in government enterprises.

Unfortunately, there are no statistics for Africa to show the numerical strength of its working class and its branch-by-branch distribution in industry. Official reports usually contain data on the number of hired workers. Some of them say it comes to 15,000,000, or 6 per cent of the continent's population. This figure, however, is not expressive of the true state of affairs, for most Africans are not regular workers. They do not sever their ties with farming; many work in industry from six months to a year. Consequently, the number of people working in industry through the year is considerably in excess of 15,000,000. The number of temporary workers employed in industry over two years is constantly increasing. These people come closest to the category of regular workers, although they still maintain ties with the countryside, where their families live.

In the African colonies, temporary workers are in no position to break completely with agriculture because the wages paid at factories, mills and plantations are absolutely insufficient to keep a family. Moreover, the absence of social insurance legislation puts the worker and his family in a desperate position if he becomes incapacitated or too old to work.

Although this migrational system, with the workers moving from one enterprise to another, created certain inconveniences and entailed constant replacements, the imperialist monopolies encouraged it because it allowed them to keep the wages down. There were hundreds of thousands of migrant workers in the African colonies. In

Southern Rhodesia, for instance, of the 610,000 hired workers in 1956 no fewer than 309,000 (more than 50 per cent) were from other colonies; in Northern Rhodesia, the figures were 263,100 and 45,300. Sixty thousand Africans from Ruanda-Urundi annually found jobs in Uganda, Tanganyika and the Belgian Congo. In 1957 the gold and coal mines of South Africa alone employed 99,000 Africans from Mozambique, 40,000 from Basutoland and 11,500 from Bechuanaland. Many people from the French Sudan used to go to Senegal for the groundnut harvest, and from Upper Volta, the French Sudan and Niger to the Gold Coast (now Ghana) and the Ivory Coast.

Migration retarded the formation of a regular working class, the development of its political awareness and the establishment of trade unions and other mass labour organisations. At the same time, it had its advantages: it strengthened the ties between the urban and rural populations and thus promoted political activity among the peasants and drew them into the struggle against colonialism.

The number of regular workers has increased noticeably in recent years. In 1947, for instance, 71 per cent of the workers employed in Northern Rhodesia's copper mines left their jobs and returned to their villages, and only 26 per cent in 1956. In Katanga, 46 per cent of all the workers employed in the copper mines in 1950 had worked there for more than ten years and only 24 per cent less than three years. The formation of a regular working class naturally proceeded more slowly in the industrially less developed countries, although there too the number of skilled workers and other people who had completely broken with agriculture kept on increasing.

The African working class thus differs substantially from the working class in the economically developed countries. It is made up mostly of farm labourers and workers employed by small enterprises. The formation of a regular proletariat is still in its initial stage. In spite of that, the workers, who have suffered more from the colonialist yoke than any other section of the population, are the most revolutionary force in the national liberation movement. The proletariat combines its class struggle

with the struggle for the abolition of colonialism, for independence.

The growth of African workers' class-consciousness has been noted even by the Jesuit padre Van Wing. "There have been changes in the proletariat's world outlook," he writes. "When I talked with workers of different professions in the past, they complained only against low wages and high living costs and especially against the outrageous housing conditions. Today they discuss the reasons for their poverty, and this is something more than comparing the whites and the blacks. They are beginning to understand the inequality of the social forces and the fatal consequences of the rule of capital."

The African labour movement grows more and more organised as the struggle against colonialism gathers momentum. So far there are not many Communist Parties on the continent. They first came into existence before the Second World War in Egypt, Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco and South Africa. Then came the Communist Parties in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan (1946), on Réunion Island (1959) and in Basutoland (1962). Their activities in the national liberation struggle have shown them to be the most staunch champions of working people's interests.

But while there are no other Communist Parties in Africa, Marxist-Leninist ideas are gaining ground. The programme of the African Independence Party, established in Senegal in 1957, says it is a working-class party and proceeds from Marxism-Leninism in its practical activity. The Sudanese Union, which is the ruling party in Mali, and the Convention People's Party of Ghana have announced in their programmes that in their activity they will be guided by the ideas of scientific socialism. New organisations and groups adopting Marxism-Leninism as their ideological foundation have of late appeared in many countries of Tropical Africa. The fog of lies about the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, spread by imperialist propaganda, is beginning to dissipate. More and more Africans are beginning to distinguish between their enemies and true friends.

In the present stage, the proletariat of the countries of Tropical Africa is organised chiefly in trade unions.

There was no organised trade union movement prior to the Second World War. It was only during, and especially after, the war that the unions began to appear in almost all the countries.

In the British colonies the unions, as a rule, were affiliated with the British TUC and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. In the French colonies the unions were affiliated, until 1956, with such metropolitan centres as the General Confederation of Labour, the Force Ouvrière and the French Confederation of Christian Workers. The most influential was the GCL. The first step towards the establishment of a centre uniting all the trade unions of French West and Equatorial Africa was made in 1956.

The trade union congress which met in Dahomey in January 1957 set up the General Workers' Union of Black Africa which, it was announced, was an autonomous trade union centre affiliated neither with the General Confederation of Labour nor with the Force Ouvrière or the French Confederation of Christian Workers. The new confederation was led by Sékou Touré, now the President of Guinea. A year later it united 98 per cent of all working people in French West Africa. By the end of 1958 the unions affiliated with it had an aggregate membership of 250,000.

The trade union movement in the Belgian colonies progressed much more slowly than in the British and French possessions.

In the Belgian Congo, the first African-led union appeared only in 1959. In the Portuguese colonies, the Africans are prohibited from establishing unions.

The African unions began to play an important role in the national liberation movement from the very inception. They fought not only for higher wages and better working conditions but for independence as well. In June 1945 the Nigerian unions organised the first general strike in the country's history, with about 150,000 factory and office workers taking part. It marked a turning point in the history of Nigeria's labour and national liberation movements. Another powerful wave of working-class action, leading to bloody clashes with the police in many

places, swept the country in 1949 in reply to the colonialist massacre of striking miners at Enugu.

At the beginning of 1950 the trade unions of the Gold Coast called a general strike which had a clear-cut political character. To quash it, the colonialist authorities proclaimed a state of emergency.

The most active part in the anti-imperialist struggle in Uganda in 1945 and 1949 was also played by the workers. In Tanganyika and Kenya, the trade unions organised several successful strikes. The strike movement assumed wide scope in Northern Rhodesia. In 1955 the miners of the Copper Belt were out for two months. To suppress a big strike in 1956 the North Rhodesian authorities instituted martial law and arrested almost all the leaders of the miners' union.

The trade unions organised in the French colonies soon after the Second World War demanded labour legislation. The French Government elaborated several decrees on labour, but they were all anti-democratic in nature, did not ensure the workers' elementary rights and, consequently, were resolutely rejected by the African unions.

Numerous strikes were called in French West and Equatorial Africa in 1951-52 in protest against the French Government's procrastination with labour legislation. The introduction of democratic legislation was demanded in 1952 by May Day demonstrations in a number of colonies. It was also the main demand of the exceptionally well organised general strike of November 3, 1952, which showed that the influence of the unions had grown. The stoppage paralysed the railways and industry, and undoubtedly expedited the approval by the French National Assembly on November 23 of a labour code for the overseas territories. The labour movement in French Tropical Africa thus scored its first major victory.

The code categorically prohibited forced labour, which had been practised widely in the French colonies, introduced a forty-hour working week and provided for two weeks' paid holidays. It recognised the right of the Africans to have unions, to conclude collective agreements with the employers, and to strike.

Although there was nothing in it about social insurance and a number of clauses, including the one about the

forty-hour working week, remained on paper, the adoption of the code was a big gain for the working class of the French colonies.

And so in spite of its relative numerical weakness the African working class is an important force in the national liberation movement. In the first stage of the anti-imperialist revolution it co-operates with the bourgeoisie and the peasants in demanding the abolition of the colonial regime and the establishment of sovereign national states. Its demands, however, are not limited to this. It strives consistently for the consummation of the national anti-imperialist revolution, democratic reforms in the political sphere, liquidation of foreign monopoly dominance, and radical agrarian reform which would give "land to the tillers".

Most of the Africans are peasants. For them, the struggle against the imperialist yoke is first and foremost a struggle for the land they have been deprived of by the colonialists. They are also fighting against the foreign companies' monopoly on sales, unbearable taxes and oppression by local feudals.

A mass peasant rising broke out in Kenya in 1952 and lasted four years. The main demand was for the land taken away from the Africans by the Europeans. In Tanganyika, the Meru tribe waged a protracted struggle for the return of the 78,000 acres of land taken from them by the colonial authorities and given to European settlers. It began in 1949 and the Africans appealed to the United Nations on several occasions to protect them against the unlawful actions of the British colonialists. To force the Africans to resettle in some other place, the colonial authorities rushed troops to the village to keep the inhabitants away while a gang of hirelings destroyed their houses and barns. About 2,500 people were left homeless. Even the Trusteeship Council, which usually sides with the colonialists, was compelled to proclaim this action unlawful. In its report for 1953-54 the Council said the administering authority should in the future be guided by the principle that the native communities which had settled down on a given territory must not be moved to other areas without their clearly expressed consent. That, however, was as far as the Trusteeship Council would

go, and the Meru were forced to move to less fertile land.

In some colonies the peasants are fighting not only against the foreign imperialists but against the local feudals as well, as they did in 1959-60 in Ruanda and Uganda.

Like the workers, the peasants want far-going democratic reforms in the social, economic and political spheres. The worker-peasant alliance is the nucleus of a wide national front which is destined to play a decisive role in the achievement of genuine independence.

The guiding force in the initial phase of the national liberation movement is usually the national bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia connected with it. Pointing out that the national bourgeoisie in the colonial countries is dual in character, the C.P.S.U. Programme says: "In modern conditions the national bourgeoisie in those colonial, one-time colonial and dependent countries where it is not connected with the imperialist circles is objectively interested in accomplishing the basic tasks of an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. Its progressive role and its ability to participate in the solution of pressing national problems are, therefore, not yet spent.

"But as the contradictions between the working people and the propertied classes grow and the class struggle inside the country becomes more acute, the national bourgeoisie shows an increasing inclination to compromise with imperialism and domestic reaction."

The African bourgeoisie's position in industry and foreign trade is extremely weak, for these branches of the economy in their countries are almost completely dominated by the foreign monopolies. Imperialism gave the national bourgeoisie very little chance to develop—and only in agriculture, handicrafts and domestic trade. Small-scale commodity farming is the main economic basis for the emergence and development of a national bourgeoisie. As we have said above, its position in the African economy is very weak and so long as foreign capital predominates it will be in no position radically to alter the situation. That is why it participates actively in the struggle against the colonial regime.

African intellectuals, most of whom come from rich families and are closely connected with the bourgeoisie, play an important role in the national liberation movement. The bulk of the intelligentsia consists of white-collar workers employed by the colonial administration, schoolteachers and medical workers (chiefly doctors' assistants and hospital attendants). In 1955 there were 107,600 African civil servants in French West Africa and 99,400 in Tanganyika. In the Belgian Congo there were 40,000 white-collar workers and more than 5,000 medical workers in 1956.

Few Africans could afford to go to universities in Britain, the United States and France. Some became active in politics on their return home. Most of the African intellectuals are imbued with bourgeois ideology and speak for bourgeois interests. A section, however, has acquainted itself with Marxism-Leninism and realises that liberated Africa can achieve rapid progress only if it takes the path of non-capitalist development. In most African countries the national bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia connected with it are the guiding force in the anti-imperialist struggle. It is these sections of the population which have organised various national parties. While there were national political parties in North African countries and the Union of South Africa even before the Second World War, in Tropical Africa they made their appearance only during and after the war.

Three parties came into existence in 1944: the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons in Nigeria, the Kenya African Association (renamed Kenya African Union in 1946) in Kenya, and the African National Congress in Nyasaland. Soon after the war national political parties were founded in other British colonies: the Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Tanganyika, Northern and Southern Rhodesia. In the French colonies, the national liberation movement was led by the African Democratic Rally, which was set up in 1946 and united the political organisations and groups in French West and Equatorial Africa. Political parties were also organised in the Togo and Cameroon trust territories: the Committee of Togoland Unity in 1945 and the Cameroon Peoples' Union in 1948. A mass political party—the Democratic Movement

for Malagasy Renovation—was established in Madagascar in 1946. Somewhat later political parties appeared in the Belgian and Portuguese possessions.

All these parties saw their main task in the achievement of independence for their countries. Among their leaders were quite a few honest, resolute and consistent opponents of colonialism who spared no effort to deliver their peoples from imperialist rule. But there were others who associated themselves with the colonialists and helped the imperialist powers retain their positions.

And so Africa's post-war socio-economic and political development created the internal prerequisites for the victory of the national anti-imperialist revolutions.

Chapter II

ABOLITION OF THE COLONIAL REGIME IN NORTH AFRICA AND THE SUDAN

Italy lost her colonial possessions in Africa as a result of the Second World War. Ethiopia, seized by fascist Italy in 1936, regained independence in 1941 after the defeat of the Italian army in East Africa. In 1952, by decision of the United Nations, Eritrea was united with Ethiopia into what came to be known as the Federation of Ethiopia and Eritrea. Libya was proclaimed independent in December 1951. Italian Somaliland alone remained under Italian administration, as a trust territory, until 1960.

The Atlantic Charter, adopted in 1941, solemnly proclaimed that after the defeat of fascism all the peoples would be ensured the right to self-determination and independence. Fascism was defeated, but the imperialists went back on their solemn promises. Sir Winston Churchill, for one, declared that the provisions of the Atlantic Charter did not extend to the colonies. The enslaved nations realised that independence could be won only in bitter struggle.

LIBERATION OF THE NILE VALLEY

The national liberation movement in Egypt assumed wide scope after the Second World War. The demand was for the annulment of the shackling Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936 and the withdrawal of British troops from the country. In December 1945, under the pressure of the anti-imperialist movement, the government headed by Nokrashy Pasha asked London to revise the treaty. Britain's rejection of this just demand evoked nation-wide indignation and led to numerous protest demonstrations. On February 21, 1946, British troops opened fire on a demon-

stration in which thousands of workers and students took part.

The reactionary Egyptian Government entered into a compact with the British colonialists. In October 1946 the new Egyptian Premier, Sidky Pasha, signed with Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin another disgraceful agreement reaffirming Britain's right to maintain bases and station troops in Egypt. This caused a new wave of wrathful protests. In the face of the mass movement, the Egyptian Parliament voted against the ratification of the agreement and the Sidky Pasha Government resigned in December 1946. The new government, again headed by Nokrashy Pasha, referred the question of the withdrawal of British troops from Egypt to the U. N. Security Council in August 1947. The Egyptian demand was resolutely supported by the Soviet Union. But the stand taken by the imperialist powers and their satellites in the U. N. prevented the Council from adopting any decision.

Meanwhile, the anti-imperialist movement in Egypt grew in scope and scale. In 1948 there were strikes by factory and office workers and mass meetings and demonstrations in Cairo, Alexandria and other cities. To quash these actions the Egyptian Government proclaimed martial law.

Popular discontent with the reactionary policy followed by the ruling element made itself clearly felt in the 1949 parliamentary elections. The petty and middle bourgeoisie, the workers and the peasants gave their votes to the Wafd Party, which spoke for the interests of the national bourgeoisie. The party owed its success to the promise to carry out social reforms and get Britain to evacuate her armed forces.

The attempt made by Premier Nahas Pasha's Wafdist government, which came to power after the elections, to reach agreement with Britain on the withdrawal of her troops failed. There was another wave of stormy demonstrations and meetings. Under the pressure of this mass movement, the government decided to denounce the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian treaty. The decision was unanimously approved by parliament on October 15, 1951.

Britain, however, ignored the will of the Egyptian people and took military action. Armed reinforcements,

rushed to the Suez Canal zone and the Sudan, occupied additional strategic points. On January 26, 1952, the British imperialists, acting in conspiracy with the Court and the U. S. Embassy in Cairo, engineered a counter-revolutionary coup which overthrew the Wafdist government. The reactionaries who seized power set out to persecute patriots, throwing thousands of them into jails and concentration camps.

Britain's aggressive action and the pro-British policy pursued by King Farouk exhausted the people's patience. On July 23, 1952, in response to a call from the secret Society of Free Officers led by Gamal Abdel Nasser, Egyptian army units mutinied and took power into their hands in Cairo and other cities. The reins of government were taken over by the newly-established Revolutionary Command Council. On July 26 King Farouk abdicated in favour of his seven-month-old son. Actually, this heralded the end of the monarchist regime. On June 18, 1953, Egypt was proclaimed a republic.

The national revolution of 1952 was anti-imperialist and anti-feudal. It abolished the monarchist system of government and undermined the influence of the bourgeoisie-feudal top crust.

In the spring of 1954 Nasser became the leader of the Revolutionary Command Council and Prime Minister. Shortly after that Britain was compelled to sign an agreement to evacuate her troops from the Suez Canal zone. This was a big victory for the Egyptian people. By 1956 there was not a single British soldier remaining on Egyptian soil.

The new republican government took certain measures to strengthen the country's economic independence. Among other things, it adopted an agrarian reform law and weakened the position of foreign monopolies and banks. On July 26, 1956, Egypt nationalised the Suez Canal Company. The profits from the exploitation of the canal now went to the Egyptians instead of foreign safes.

From the point of view of the colonialists this was an intolerable infringement upon the rights of the imperialist monopolies. For what the Egyptian people had done could easily be done by any other nation, and that would

jeopardise the imperialist monopolies' rule in the dependent countries.

The imperialists decided to prevent the Egyptian Government from consummating this lawful act. At the end of October 1956 Britain, France and Israel launched an armed intervention. The Egyptian people rose in defence of their gains and were given powerful support by all the peace-loving forces of the world, notably the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government resolutely condemned the aggression and demanded the immediate withdrawal of the Anglo-Franco-Israeli armed forces from Egypt. It warned that it would come to the Egyptian people's assistance if the aggression continued. The firm stand taken by the U.S.S.R., which resolutely and consistently upholds the cause of little countries, forced the imperialist powers to give up their adventuristic plans and withdraw their troops. Their evacuation was completed in November.

The fiasco of the imperialist aggression had important international repercussions. Britain and France had attacked Egypt with large forces not only because they wanted her to capitulate but also to intimidate other Afro-Asian countries and paralyse their will to independence. It was a desperate attempt to halt the all-out disintegration and collapse of the colonial system by force of arms. The consequences were diametrically opposite to what the imperialist adventurers had expected. The Egyptian people's victory merely stimulated the national liberation movement in all African countries. The African nations saw that in the new historical conditions they could uphold their independence and that in their just struggle they could rely on the support of all the democratic forces of the world, and especially on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

* * *

The victory scored by the revolution in Egypt did much to help the Sudan achieve independence. In 1899 this country formally became a British and Egyptian condominium under the name of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Actually, it was a British colony. The Second World War led to an upsurge in the national liberation movement. In 1942 the Sudanese Congress, which united all the pro-

gressive political organisations in the country, sent the British governor-general a memorandum demanding home rule. The British authorities rejected this demand. After the war the Sudanese Congress sent the governor-general another resolution demanding the formation of a free, democratic government and union with Egypt. This resolution likewise was turned down. In the meantime contradictions within the Congress became sharper and finally split the organisation.

The biggest political parties to emerge after the split were the Ashigga and the Umma. The former united the section of the national bourgeoisie which demanded the Sudan's liberation from the British yoke and her union with Egypt. Its members were tradesmen, handicraftsmen, workers, junior civil servants, teachers and medical workers. The Umma demanded independence too but favoured close ties with Britain. This party spoke for the interests of the Sudanese feudals and the bourgeoisie connected with British capital. The bulk of the party's membership came from the countryside, where the influence of the clergy and clan and tribal chieftains was still strong. The nucleus of the party's leadership was made up of high-paid native officials of the colonial administration. The British gave the party every support.

The Sudanese political parties, including the Ashigga and the Umma, formed a single delegation for the 1946 Anglo-Egyptian negotiations on the revision of the 1936 treaty. It was led by Ismail Al Azhari, the leader of the Ashigga, and its programme of national demands took into account the viewpoints of both parties. These demands included 1) formation of a free, democratic Sudanese government within the framework of an alliance with Egypt and co-operation with Britain; 2) establishment of an Anglo-Egyptian-Sudanese committee to discuss proposals on the transfer of governmental functions to the Sudanese at the earliest convenience, and 3) guarantees for the freedom of the press, assembly, movement and trade throughout the Sudan.

The British Government had no intention of satisfying the Sudanese demands. Addressing the North Sudanese Consultative Council, Governor-General Hubert Huddleston declared that in twenty years' time the Sudanese

might rule their country with the assistance of foreign advisers, experts and technicians, but that at present it was too early to discuss changes in the country's status.

Although the post-war Anglo-Egyptian negotiations directly affected the Sudan's interests, her representatives were not admitted to them even as observers, to say nothing of equal partners.

The Anglo-Egyptian agreement of October 20, 1946, left intact Britain's privileges as a colonial power both in Egypt and in the Sudan. The condominium regime in the Sudan remained in force. It was only the spread of the national liberation movement that induced the Labour Government to carry out a constitutional reform.

After this reform, in 1948, the North Sudanese Consultative Council was reorganised into a legislative assembly and the governor-general's Council into an executive council. These new institutions, however, should not be identified with legislative bodies in independent countries. The Sudanese Legislative Assembly enjoyed no legislative prerogatives. The governor-general could annul any of its decisions and appoint or dismiss any Minister. In short, the constitutional reform in no way altered the essence of the colonial regime.

The year 1948 was distinguished by large-scale actions against colonial rule, with the working class playing a big part in them. In the spring there was a 33-day-long general strike on the railways and halfway through the year strikes were called by factory and office workers in Juba and tenant farmers in Gezira.

The first election to the Legislative Assembly was held on November 13, 1948. In response to a call from political parties most of the Sudanese boycotted it; according to official figures, only 19 per cent of the voters went to the polls. The Legislative Assembly thus "elected" was made up of big feudals, tribal chieftains and high-ranking colonial administration officials and, naturally, was not a representative body. The Executive Council was likewise dominated by people devoted to the interests of British imperialism, chiefly by members of the Umma.

The British colonialists' hopes that the constitutional reform would weaken the national liberation movement

fell through. The demand for full independence became more widespread than ever after the promulgation of the Constitution.

A new progressive organisation, the Sudan Movement for National Liberation, was established at the end of 1948 and it launched a large-scale campaign against the British Government's constitutional manoeuvres and for genuine independence. The Sudanese workers and progressive intellectuals took an active part in this organisation. From 1949 to 1952 the Sudanese unions called eight general strikes of economic and political character.

The liberation struggle continued to gain in scope and the British Government decided to undertake another manoeuvre and revise the new Constitution. Its draft was completed by the summer of 1951.

Despite the obstacles raised by the colonialists, the Sudanese people persevered in their efforts for independence. A new political situation arose after October 15, 1951, when the Egyptian Parliament decided to abrogate the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936 and the Anglo-Egyptian convention on the Sudan condominium of 1899. This stimulated the Sudanese to further decisive action. On the initiative of the Sudan Movement for National Liberation, all of the country's parties and organisations, with the exception of the Umma, merged to form the National Unity Front. The anti-imperialist movement assumed an unprecedented scope. Its participants included workers, peasants, handicraftsmen, students, small tradesmen, and patriotically-minded representatives of the intelligentsia and the national bourgeoisie. In January 1952 the British colonial authorities hastened to submit to the Legislative Assembly the draft Constitution which proclaimed the Sudan an autonomous state with its own parliament and government. The British governor-general, however, was to remain at the head of the state and enjoy full powers. The British Government's concession came too late. The mass movement for independence foiled the manoeuvre. Although the draft Constitution was approved by the Legislative Assembly, the 1952 revolution in Egypt brought an end to the condominium regime in the Sudan. Britain was compelled to sign an agreement with Egypt granting the Sudan the right to self-government.

In November 1953 the Sudanese elected their first-ever parliament. This was followed by the formation of a national government which set out to build a new state apparatus.

In August 1955 the Sudanese Parliament unanimously decided to abolish the condominium regime and to demand the evacuation of all foreign troops. In December of the same year it adopted a decision to proclaim the Sudan an independent sovereign republic. The British and Egyptian flags were lowered on January 1, 1956, and the Sudan became an independent state.

MOROCCO AND TUNISIA ACHIEVE INDEPENDENCE

For 44 years Morocco was under the heel of the French colonialists and for 44 years her people waged a bitter struggle against the hated protectorate treaty of 1912 which had turned their country into a French colony. In the Second World War the Moroccans fought side by side with the other freedom-loving nations against fascism, hoping that victory would bring them deliverance and independence.

The Istiqlal (Independence) Party, formed at the end of 1943 and the beginning of 1944, put forward a programme calling for the establishment of an independent state which would include the French and Spanish zones of Morocco.

An active struggle for independence was conducted in the war years by the Moroccan Communist Party. Before the war, the local communist organisations were part of the French Communist Party. In 1943 the Moroccan Communist Party became an independent organisation and this served to enhance its influence among the Arab masses. In the programme it adopted in 1946 the party demanded the annulment of the protectorate treaty and all agreements impinging upon the country's sovereignty, reunification of Moroccan territory then under French and Spanish administration, abolition of the international status of Tangier, withdrawal of all foreign troops, and establishment of a genuinely democratic regime after the proclamation of independence.

The pressure of the masses demanding the abrogation of the 1912 treaty intensified considerably after the war. Alarmed by the spread of the national liberation movement, the French imperialists in 1950 offered Sultan Mohammed Ben Youssef Sidi to extend the powers of the local government bodies. The Sultan, however, insisted on full independence and the cancellation of the 1912 treaty. The French Government rejected these demands.

The French imperialists tried to quash the national liberation movement by intensifying terror, but reprisals did not bring the desired results: the struggle for independence continued to gather momentum. The French Government's decision to replace the unpopular Resident-General Alphonse Juin by Augustin Guillaume did not help either. The new resident-general proved to be just as ruthless and tyrannical.

On March 14, 1952, the Sultan sent the French Government a letter in which he again demanded the annulment of the 1912 treaty and independence for Morocco. There were mass demonstrations and strikes in support of these demands in all the bigger cities.

The French Government persisted in refusing to discuss the Moroccan independence issue and stepped up reprisals. In December 1952 it outlawed the Communist and Istiqlal parties. Twelve Communist Party and thirty Istiqlal leaders were put behind bars and progressive publications banned. In August 1953 the French imperialists deposed Mohammed Ben Youssef and exiled him first to Corsica and then to Madagascar, and proclaimed their placeman Mohammed Ben Arafa sultan.

The reactionary August coup served as a signal for nation-wide demonstrations. The Moroccan people resolutely demanded the restoration of Mohammed Ben Youssef and independence for their country. Guerrilla units began to appear throughout the country. Between August 20, 1953, and July 13, 1954, they made 335 sorties and derailed six trains. Paris rushed more reinforcements to North Africa to suppress the growing movement. In May 1954 Resident-General Guillaume was dismissed. His replacement by the experienced diplomat Francis Lacoste signified that the big stick policy had failed. Repressions did not bring the results expected by the French Govern-

ment and it decided to try other methods of combating the popular movement.

The Mendès-France Government, which came to power in June 1954, announced that it was ready to negotiate with Moroccan representatives. That, however, was just another ruse to which the French ruling element resorted to impose their own solution of the problem on the Moroccan people. Meanwhile, the mass liberation movement continued to grow: the working class, the peasants and the national bourgeoisie formed a single anti-imperialist front. The working class played an especially active role in the independence movement. A general strike was called on August 20, 1954, the anniversary of the counter-revolutionary coup, and a further wave of strikes swept the country in November. The strikers demanded the return of the exiled Sultan, the release of political prisoners and democratic freedoms for Morocco. The national liberation army, formed in the Rif and Middle Atlas areas in the autumn of 1955, went into action to free the country by force of arms.

The French Government was eventually compelled to negotiate. On August 25, 1955, it signed an agreement providing for the restoration of Sultan Mohammed Ben Youssef, the establishment of a regency council and the formation of a Moroccan government. On October 30 the French placeman Mohammed Ben Arafa abdicated under the pressure of public opinion and on November 16 Mohammed Ben Youssef, who had been in exile for more than two years, returned to Morocco.

The first national government, formed by Si Bekkai on December 7, 1955, consisted of representatives of the Istiqlal and Democratic Independence parties and Independents. The bourgeois coalition decided against the inclusion of any members of the Moroccan Communist Party, one of the most influential forces in the national liberation movement. The new Moroccan Government was not a full-fledged executive body because the French retained control of foreign affairs and defence.

The Franco-Moroccan negotiations on Morocco's status, begun in February 1956, ended on March 2 in the signing of a joint statement in which France recognised the independence of Morocco and agreed to the abrogation of

the 1912 treaty. Morocco became a sovereign state in matters of home and foreign policy and acquired the right to have a national army. The French Government, however, retained its bases on her territory and reserved the right to protect the interests of the French settlers.

The March 1956 agreement was a major victory for the Moroccan people. Their stubborn struggle had at long last yielded fruit—it brought them independence. The French Government was forced to take this step in order not to forfeit its political influence and to preserve its economic and strategic positions in Morocco.

The question of Spanish Morocco's destiny was solved shortly after the conclusion of the Franco-Moroccan agreement. In April 1956 Spain recognised the independence of Morocco and agreed to turn over the administration in the Spanish zone to the Moroccan authorities. A declaration on the abolition of the "international status" of Tangier was signed at an international conference in October, and on January 1, 1957, this city was incorporated in Morocco. Nevertheless, Spain still retains part of Moroccan territory: the towns of Ceuta and Melilla and some small islands in the north, and the Ifni enclave and the provinces of Saguia el Hamra and Rio de Oro, which are a part of the so-called Spanish Sahara, in the south. The population of these territories are demanding the evacuation of Spanish troops and reunion with Morocco. There is no doubt that with time they will be delivered from the Spanish colonial yoke and reunited with the mother country.

* * *

Tunisia was seized by the French imperialists in 1881. As in Morocco, the national liberation movement assumed wide proportions during the Second World War. Before the war, the national liberation movement was led by the liberal-constitutional Neo-Destour Party. In 1926 the Tunisian Communists founded a party which demanded the abolition of the protectorate regime, the convocation of a Constituent Assembly and the formation of an independent Tunisian government.

The Tunisian people resumed their struggle for independence and the abolition of the protectorate regime after

the war. The Neo-Destour Party at first followed a policy of "honourable compromise", hoping that France would reward it for its co-operation by granting internal autonomy to Tunisia. However, the negotiations with the French Government in the latter half of 1950 made it clear that the imperialists were not inclined to make any concessions. This caused the Neo-Destour leaders to alter their tactics. At the end of 1951 the party appealed to the people to fight more resolutely for the satisfaction of their national demands.

The French colonial authorities retaliated with reprisals. Early in 1952 they arrested the leaders of the Tunisian Communist Party, the Neo-Destour and other organisations, and followed this up by closing progressive publications.

The Tunisians replied to this terror with active struggle and formed guerilla detachments which became the nucleus of the Liberation Army. They blew up bridges, destroyed communications, attacked French army barracks, bases and police stations, and in some places engaged large French forces. In 1952-54 the country was swept by patriotic demonstrations, strikes and boycott and disobedience campaigns. In July 1954 the French Government was forced to grant Tunisia internal autonomy.

The first national government, which was formed in September of that year, immediately initiated negotiations with the French Government on its implementation.

The conventions signed on June 3, 1955, placed internal administration under the control of the Tunisian Government. The latter, however, promised not to nationalise industry or undertake an agrarian reform. France reserved the right to determine the country's foreign policy and protect the interests of French settlers, which made it possible for her to interfere in Tunisia's domestic affairs.

Although the 1955 agreement was an important step towards liberation from French rule, it did not put an end to the country's political dependence on France. The 1881 treaty on the protectorate remained in force. Consequently, the Tunisian Government regarded internal autonomy only as a first step towards complete independence and

continued its negotiations with Paris. On March 20, 1956, France finally signed a protocol recognising Tunisia's political independence. The 1881 treaty was abrogated and the Tunisian Government became sovereign in both domestic and foreign affairs.

After the achievement of independence the Neo-Destour became the ruling party and its leader, Habib Bourguiba, Prime Minister.

On July 25, 1957, Tunisia was proclaimed a republic and Bourguiba was elected its first President.

The national liberation movement in Morocco and Tunisia triumphed thanks to the activity of the masses. French imperialism was powerless to combat the mass movements which had simultaneously unfolded in all the colonies. The war in Algeria, a country it was set to keep at any price, demanded huge financial outlays and enormous military efforts. In these circumstances, the French Government was forced to make concessions to Morocco and Tunisia. In granting them political independence, the colonialists hoped to safeguard their economic and strategic position there and at the same time untie their hands to suppress the rising in Algeria.

THE ALGERIAN PEOPLE'S VICTORY

French imperialism had always attached particular importance to Algeria. The colonialists began to pursue a policy of integration immediately after the conquest of this country in 1830. The best lands were taken from the Arabs and sold to French settlers for next to nothing. No effort was spared to propagate the idea that Algeria was a constituent part of France. "Algeria is France," the colonialists insisted. But the country's Arab population resolutely stood up for its right to independent national existence and waged a bitter struggle against French rule.

The French imperialists' position in North Africa was seriously undermined by the Second World War and that stimulated the national liberation movement. In February 1943 representatives of the Algerian liberal bourgeoisie rallying round Ferhat Abbas sent the French National

Committee of Liberation, led by Charles de Gaulle, the Manifesto of the Algerian People which demanded internal autonomy for Algeria on a federal basis. "Algeria must again become an independent Moslem state in which all citizens are equal," the Manifesto said. In March 1944 Ferhat Abbas founded the Friends of the Manifesto and Liberty organisation which launched a struggle for autonomy.

A spontaneous rising broke out in Algeria in May 1945, at the time the world was celebrating victory over fascist Germany. The colonialists mercilessly suppressed the insurgents, killing more than 40,000 of them.

The Algerian people's post-war struggle for independence was long and costly.

For more than seven years, from November 1954 to March 1962, French imperialism waged its "dirty war" against the Algerian people who rose courageously with arms in hand to uphold their right to independence. These years of incessant fighting cost hundreds of thousands of Algerian patriots their lives.

The French imperialists made desperate efforts to keep Algeria for a number of economic, political and strategic reasons. The extremely rich deposits of oil and other minerals discovered in the Sahara gave the French ruling element hope to strengthen the French monopolies' position in the capitalist world. A considerable section of French settlers in Algeria, who had concentrated the country's key economic positions in their hands and did not want to give up their privileges, exerted a strong pressure on the French Government's policy. The European settlers, particularly the most reactionary ones—the Algerian ultras, stubbornly opposed any attempt to satisfy the Arab population's aspirations to self-government and independence. All these circumstances complicated the Algerian people's struggle and demanded heroic efforts.

The guiding role in the struggle for independence was played by the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties. In the elections to the French Constituent Assembly in 1946, the Democratic Union of the Algerian Manifesto, established by Ferhat Abbas in March of that same year, won eleven of the thirteen seats allotted to the Algerians. A

new petty-bourgeois party uniting small tradesmen, handicraftsmen, intellectuals and a section of the working class and peasantry—the Triumph of Democratic Freedom—came into existence in 1946.

One of the most influential political organisations in the country was the Algerian Communist Party. It came into being in 1920 as an organisation of the French Communist Party and became an independent party in 1936. In 1946 it published a manifesto demanding the establishment of an Algerian democratic republic and the formation of an Algerian government. It advocated the unity of all national and democratic forces in the struggle for independence and in that same year urged the organisation of an Algerian national democratic front in the struggle for an Algerian republic, land and bread. Its appeals found a ready response among the broad masses and led to the establishment of the Algerian Front for the Defence of Political Freedoms in 1951. Although this organisation later disintegrated, the idea of the unity of all national democratic forces took firm root in Algerian minds. That the Algerian Communist Party enjoyed great authority may be seen from the results of the municipal elections in 1950 and the parliamentary elections of 1951, when it won most seats in several towns (including Oran) and in many rural areas.

The French colonialists' resistance to the Algerian people's demands aggravated the political situation. Many liberation movement leaders had become convinced that it was impossible to achieve anything peacefully and that, consequently, an armed rising alone would bring freedom. In July 1954 the Triumph of Democratic Freedom organisation broke up, and some of its members established the Revolutionary Committee of Unity and Action which announced its preparedness to achieve independence at any price. In the early hours of November 1, 1954, it raised an insurrection against the French.

The struggle for independence was led by the National Liberation Front which came into existence shortly after the uprising. The guerilla detachments were united into a national liberation army. The Communist Party's Freedom Fighters military organisation, which had operated by itself, merged with the National Liberation Army in

July 1956, thus uniting with the other patriotic forces and enhancing unity of action.

The French Government rushed reinforcements to Algeria but proved incapable of coping with the movement which was sweeping the country. Kabylia, which accounts for one-third of the country's indigenous population, was soon entirely under the control of the insurgents. The French continued to increase their armed forces. There were 450,000 officers and men in Algeria in 1957 and upwards of 700,000 by the end of 1959. The "dirty war" was enormously costly and seriously undermined French prestige abroad. The French colonialists' disgraceful actions were condemned by progressives everywhere. The Algerian question was repeatedly raised in the U.N. General Assembly. The French imperialists, however, ignored the U.N. decisions and, defying common sense, went on claiming that Algeria was France.

On May 13, 1958, the Algerian ultra-colonialists engineered armed uprisings in all major cities under an "Algeria remains French" slogan. The movement was directed by reactionary generals, among them Massu, Salan and Jouhaud. On the orders of the so-called Committee of Public Salvation, the colonists and the army officers began to seize government offices and to evict the prefects and elected mayors.

The Algerian ultras co-ordinated their action with that of the reactionary forces in France. General Charles de Gaulle's advent to power in July 1 filled the reactionaries with the hope that his government would succeed in quashing the Algerian independence movement. De Gaulle, however, realised that a policy of strength alone was of no avail and decided to resort to manoeuvres and negotiations.

On September 16, 1959, he made a programmatic statement in which he offered a referendum on the Algerian question. The population of Algeria was asked to answer three questions: 1) does it want complete integration and assimilation with France; 2) does it want internal autonomy within the French Community; 3) does it want complete secession from France.

De Gaulle's statement was tantamount to the French ruling element's recognition of the impossibility of solv-

ing the Algerian question on the basis of the "Algeria is France" principle. It was the first time that the head of the French Government had declared that Algeria was not a part of France and that the Algerians were not Frenchmen. It also spelt finis to the plans of forcibly incorporating Algeria in France.

General de Gaulle's statement could have become a basis for negotiations between the Algerian Provisional Government, which was established in 1958, and the French Government. But it soon became clear that this statement was merely a ruse to get the National Liberation Army to capitulate. The French Government had no desire to indulge in political negotiations; all it proposed was to discuss military questions linked with the ceasefire. The Algerian Provisional Government saw through de Gaulle's plans and refused to negotiate.

The September 16 statement evoked profound discontent among the Algerian ultra-colonialists and they demanded that the French Government continue with the old policy. In January 1960 they again organised anti-government demonstrations in Algerian cities. This time, however, their effort found no support in the army and fell through.

On June 14, 1960, de Gaulle came out with another statement on the Algerian issue. He reaffirmed that Algeria was entitled to self-determination and announced that he was ready to meet the leaders of the national liberation movement and discuss a ceasefire.

The Algerian Provisional Government accepted the proposal and sent a delegation headed by Prime Minister Ferhat Abbas to France. Preliminary negotiations in Mélun at the end of June revealed, however, that de Gaulle had not given up the idea of getting the Algerians to capitulate. Although ostensibly his government recognised Algeria's right to self-determination, it did everything to put the Algerian delegation in an unequal position and dictate to it. In these circumstances, it was only natural that the Algerians refused to negotiate. Explaining to the Algerian people why the Mélun talks had broken down, Ferhat Abbas said: "In Mélun our emissaries met with a categorical refusal on the part of the French to conduct real negotiations. The French Government wants to dic-

tate conditions, and they are so restrictive and humiliating that they make free negotiations at present nothing but an illusion."

The Algerian people's fight for independence won the sympathy and support of all the progressive forces in the world. France's NATO allies began to find it ever more difficult to defend the French imperialists in the United Nations. On December 15, 1960, the U.N. Political Committee adopted by 63 votes to eight, with 27 abstentions, a resolution recognising the Algerian people's right to self-determination and independence.

The French Government, however, ignored world public opinion and persevered in preserving its rule in Algeria. To win support for his home policy, de Gaulle decided to hold a referendum on January 8, 1961. The voter was asked to say Yes to the following question: "Do you approve of the bill which has been submitted for consideration to the French people and which concerns self-determination for the Algerian population and the organisation of state power in Algeria pending self-determination?" The voter was thus asked to approve both the principle of self-determination and the organisation of state power in Algeria pending self-determination. The second part of the question, however, virtually excluded the first, for even if the voter said Yes, the French Government would still have ample opportunity to impose upon Algeria the organs of power which would serve the interests of the French imperialists. The principle of self-determination was thus emasculated. The French Communist Party exposed the manoeuvres of the de Gaulle Government and called upon the voters to say No in the referendum. The government, however, resorted to coercion and wrested "approval" for its policy from the majority of voters.

In the spring of 1961 the French Government again proclaimed its willingness to negotiate with the Algerian Provisional Government. The programme of negotiations was outlined by de Gaulle in a radio and TV broadcast on May 8, 1961. The French President told the Algerian people to choose between association with France and partition. What the Algerians were offered under the guise of association was a new yoke—a slightly altered form of

colonialism under which the French imperialists would fully preserve their dominant position. As for the partition plan, it provided for the severance of the oil- and mineral-rich Sahara, which constitutes four-fifths of the country's territory, from Algeria and its annexation by France. In any case, France insisted on the preservation of her military bases in Algeria and the privileges of the European settlers. This was the programme with which the French came to the Evian Conference, which opened on May 20.

The Algerian people, who had shed so much blood in their struggle for freedom, were not inclined to tolerate French colonial rule in their country or surrender any part of their territory. The Algerian delegation in Evian rejected these unjust demands. The Sahara, and all the other areas of the country, it said, were an integral part of independent Algeria. The Algerians were not against the French taking part in the extraction of oil and other minerals, but insisted that they alone were their owners.

The Algerian delegation was also opposed to the French settlers in Algeria preserving their privileges. It stressed that in free Algeria there could be no two states—one for the Algerians and the other for the European minority. On June 14, after three weeks of negotiations, the Evian Conference was adjourned at the demand of the French delegation. The talks were resumed some time later at Legrin but brought no results.

In the summer of 1961 the Algerian Provisional Government was reorganised. The new government, headed by Youssef Ben Khedda, proclaimed the Algerian people's firm determination to strive for independence and establish a democratic republic. The government's programmatic statement said: "We are not fighting because we like war. War has been forced upon us. The fact that we are resolved to achieve our aims through struggle does not mean that we do not want to negotiate peace with France, provided she renounces the negative policy which wrecked the talks in Evian and Legrin."

The new government continued negotiations on the ceasefire and independence. They ended in the signing of the Evian agreements on March 18, 1962. This was a big victory for the Algerian people in their long-drawn-out

war of independence. The French Government had realised that it was impossible to preserve its rule in Algeria and conceded the basic demands of the Algerian Provisional Government, and recognised Algeria's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

The Evian provisions were as follows. After the ceasefire there was to be a transition period regime established on the territory of Algeria and a provisional executive committee formed of Algerian and French representatives. The main task of the Provisional Executive Committee was to prepare a referendum to be held within six months after the ceasefire on whether or not the Algerian people wanted independence and, if yes, whether or not they were prepared to co-operate with France on the basis of the Evian agreements.

The French High Commissioner remained in authority during the transition period and in command of the French armed forces in Algeria. The Provisional Executive Committee had at its disposal a 60,000-strong Arab army and police. The French army was to abstain from any actions tending to hamper the people from freely expressing their will. The Evian agreements provided for the release of all Algerian patriots. Algerians who had fled their country could return without fear of being persecuted. The referendum was to be followed by elections to the National Assembly which would form a sovereign government. The two sides agreed that the Provisional Executive Committee would then transfer its functions to the elected legislative and executive bodies. Such was to be the procedure of Algeria's transition from colonial status to independence and sovereignty.

The Evian agreements secured France's economic interests. Algeria was to remain within the franc zone but have her own currency. The Sahara's mineral wealth was to be jointly exploited by Algeria and France. French companies were given priority rights to extract and export the Sahara oil to France and other countries in the franc zone. The Algerian Government guaranteed the safety of private property. France, for her part, promised to render Algeria economic, financial, technical and cultural assistance on the basis of bilateral agreements.

French troops were to be evacuated within three years; their strength was to be reduced to 80,000 within a year. France retained the right to use the naval base at Mers-el-Kebir for fifteen years.

The question concerning the European part of the population was solved as follows. The Europeans were given the right to choose between Algerian and other citizenship within three years. In the meantime they were to enjoy all the rights and freedoms of Algerian citizens. If after three years a European decided to take out the papers of some foreign state, he could remain in Algeria and enjoy the same rights as all foreigners. If he took out Algerian papers, he automatically acquired the rights of an Algerian citizen.

A referendum on what the French thought of the Evian agreements was held in France on April 8, 1962. Most of the voters (85 per cent) voted for peace in Algeria and recognition of her independence. Commenting on the results, Etienne Fajon, a member of the French Communist Party's Political Bureau, wrote in the Paris *Humanité*: "Millions of voters said Yes to the success of their own struggle, which helped the Algerian people in their heroic fight and forced the present government to conclude peace."

But while the French working people resolutely came out for peace in Algeria, the reactionaries from the terrorist Organisation armée secrète (OAS) and the most bellicose section of the French bourgeoisie supporting it made desperate efforts to torpedo the Evian agreements. According to press reports, thousands of Arabs were murdered or wounded in Algiers, Oran and other cities. Within seven weeks after the signing of the Evian agreements the OAS men killed 1,000 and wounded 1,550 in Algiers alone. The victorious Algerian people did not slacken their vigilance and showed that they were ready to rebuff provocations.

The Soviet Union always sympathised with the Algerian people's struggle for independence and gave all-round support to the Algerian Provisional Government from its very inception. During Ferhat Abbas's visit to the U.S.S.R. in the autumn of 1960, N. S. Khrushchov said: "It follows from our meetings and talks that we recognise the Algerian

Provisional Government *de facto*." The Soviet Union repeatedly advocated the settlement of the Algerian issue through peaceful negotiations. Speaking in the U.N. First Committee on December 13, 1960, Soviet representative Valerian Zorin said: "The Soviet Union upholds the Algerian people's lawful right to freedom and independence and insists on an immediate ceasefire in Algeria. The Soviet Government is sure that the Algerian problem can and must be settled peacefully on the basis of Algeria's self-determination and with due consideration of the interests of both Algeria and France." As a champion of nations' right to independent development, the Soviet Government sincerely welcomed the Franco-Algerian agreement. On March 19, 1962, Premier Khrushchov warmly congratulated the Premier of the Algerian Provisional Government on the signing of the agreement on Algeria's self-determination and the ceasefire, and informed him of the Soviet Government's decision to accord *de jure* recognition to the Algerian Provisional Government.

In the referendum held in Algeria in accordance with the Evian agreements on July 1, 1962, the overwhelming majority (99.7 per cent) voted for independence. On September 20 the Algerian people went to the polls to elect the National Constituent Assembly, and these elections brought a smashing victory to the National Liberation Front. Five days later, on the 25th, the National Constituent Assembly solemnly proclaimed the establishment of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic and elected Ahmed Ben Bella Premier.

The establishment of the Algerian Republic offers its people wide opportunities for independent development along the path of peace and progress.

Chapter III TROPICAL AFRICA SMASHES COLONIAL CHAINS

For centuries the peoples of Tropical Africa languished under the iron heel of the colonialists. Prior to the Second World War the indigenous population were deprived of all political rights and prevented from taking any part in the administration of their countries. Tropical Africa had known many risings against the hated invader, but they were ill organised and unco-ordinated and were easily suppressed by the imperialists.

The Second World War stimulated the political activity of the masses. In the early post-war years there appeared a new, serious revolutionary force—the demobilised servicemen who had fought in the Allied armies in North and East Africa, Madagascar, Burma and Europe. When these war veterans who had seen another world returned home they became splendid agitators against the colonial regime. The discontent of these demobilised soldiers was increased by their inability to find work.

The national liberation struggle was also influenced to a certain extent by the Pan-African movement which came into existence after the First World War. Initially, it united American Negroes and African students and emigrants in Europe. The first four Pan-African congresses were held in Europe and the United States before the Second World War and did very little to advance the cause of the national liberation movement.

The Fifth Pan-African Congress, convoked in Manchester in October 1945, proved to be more productive. For, unlike the first four, it was widely representative of the political parties and organisations operating on African territory.

Its resolutions were pronouncedly anti-colonial. The Congress sharply condemned colonialism and the imperial-

ist powers' refusal to grant independence to the colonial countries. The basic demands it formulated were as follows: abolition of the imperialist powers' political and economic control, racial discrimination and compulsory labour; establishment of democratic regimes in Africa; trade union freedoms; solution of the land problem. In its Declaration to the Colonial Powers, the Congress said: "The peoples of the colonies must have the right to elect their own governments, without restrictions from foreign powers. We say to the peoples of the colonies that they must fight for these ends by all means at their disposal." The Congress emphasised that the main task before the African political parties was to organise the masses.

The decisions of the Fifth Pan-African Congress reflected the radical changes in the international situation caused by the rout of the fascist powers and the growing political activity of the masses in Africa itself.

The war was still going on when an anti-imperialist rising broke out in Uganda in January 1945. The direct cause was the sharply deteriorating position of the African population: while commodity prices kept going up, wages remained at an extremely low level. The Africans put the blame for their plight on the hated colonial regime.

First came the strike in Masaka, on January 5. This was followed by workers walking out in Entebbe, Kampala, Koja, Jinja and other towns. The demands everywhere were the same: higher wages, broader African representation in the Lukiko, the Representative Assembly of the feudal "Kingdom" of Buganda (the most developed of Uganda's provinces), and resignation of the British colonialists' flunkey, the Bugandan Finance Minister Kulubya. These demands clearly showed that the stoppage pursued political as well as economic aims.

To suppress the rising, the British colonialists hastened to form armed European detachments. Army units were rushed to Kampala, where the movement acquired the greatest proportions. Bloody clashes between troops and the Africans occurred in Koja, Masaka and other places. The rising assumed such scope that the British authorities had to bring troops in from Kenya. The insurrection was suppressed by January 24, but small strikes continued until early February.

After that the British launched mass reprisals against the participants. Three hundred and nineteen people were arrested in Kampala and 239 in Jinja and East Kyegegwa. Arrests all over the country continued all through the year.

But the British colonialists apparently realised that it was necessary to make certain concessions. They raised the wages and made some insignificant amendments to the electoral laws.

The first Africans—three of them—entered the 18-man Ugandan Legislative Council in November 1945. As before, there was not a single African in the Executive Council. The appearance of three Africans in the Legislative Council was an important development, though it in no way affected the dominant position occupied by the British.

The 1945 rising in Uganda had momentous consequences. It showed the Africans the potentialities of organised action and paved the way to mass anti-colonial movement.

Uganda was again swept by serious unrest in 1949, when the Africans demanded the democratisation of the Legislative Council and the Lukiko, establishment of fair prices for agricultural produce, and higher wages. As in 1945, troops were rushed in from Kenya and a great many Africans were thrown into jail. The movement was repressed.

* * *

The national liberation movement in Kenya rapidly gained in scope after the Second World War. The people's fight for freedom and independence was led by the Kenya African Union, uniting broad sections of the population—workers, peasants, office employees and professionals. It demanded land for landless and land-poor peasants, broader political rights for the Africans, greater African representation in the Legislative Council, an end to racial discrimination, freedom for trade unions, and expansion of the educational system.

There were rallies and meetings all the country over, with Union members urging the people to fight for constitutional reforms which would give them the right to

govern their country, for agrarian reform, higher wages and better working conditions, recognition of trade union freedoms, liquidation of illiteracy. Some 30,000 people took part in a meeting in Nairobi in October 1951. Another mass meeting, in Getunguri, in July 1952, was attended by 30,000 peasants from all corners of the country. One of the songs they sang had the words: "We'll never stop fighting for our land, it was and will be ours for ever."

The movement seriously alarmed the British colonialists and they resorted to provocations to prevent its spread. In August 1952 the British bourgeois press published sensational reports on Mau Mau. This was a secret terrorist society, it was alleged, and it had set itself the task of exterminating all the Europeans in Kenya.

There were indeed a great many small secret organisations of sectarian type opposing alien rule in Kenya, but it is still to be proved that there was one called Mau Mau. The name itself has no meaning and was probably invented by the colonialists. What is clear is that the activities of the numerous secret sects presented no serious threat to British rule in Kenya because the influence they exerted on the broad masses was insignificant. The colonialists saw greater danger in the activity of the Kenya African Union, which was supported by workers, peasants and intellectuals, and it was to suppress it that they started spreading rumours about the Mau Mau and its plans to annihilate Europeans.

On October 20, 1952, the authorities proclaimed a state of emergency and set out to arrest Union militants. Among those thrown into jail were national liberation movement leaders Jomo Kenyatta, Fred Kubai and Richard Achieng Oneko. Kenyatta was arrested on the framed-up charge of being the Mau Mau leader.* In April 1953 the Union leaders were sentenced—some to imprisonment, others to hard labour, still others to exile in the remote parts of Northern Province. The organisation itself was banned.

Mass reprisals were taken against the Kikuyus, the

* In November 1958 one of the prosecution witnesses, Macharia, confessed in court that the colonial authorities had paid him £1,358 to give false evidence against Kenyatta.

biggest (over 1,000,000) national group in Kenya. Under the pretext of fighting the Mau Mau, the colonialists incarcerated about 80,000 of the most active freedom fighters in concentration camps in the four years ending 1956. Police parties raided African villages, seized innocent people and confiscated their cattle. The British colonial authorities sought to justify their actions by claiming that they were fighting Mau Mau terror. This version, however, was belied by the facts: only one (!) European was killed from April 1952 to the day the state of emergency was proclaimed in October.

The population fled from colonialist terror into the jungles and began to form guerilla units.

The British imperialists, who had launched a colonial war against the people of Kenya, undertook a number of operations in 1953 to wipe out the guerillas operating in the mountains. Their attempts to do so at one blow failed. The guerillas enjoyed wide support among the population. Their ranks gradually grew; the various groups began to co-ordinate their actions and work out tactical methods of fighting the British forces. The African Liberation Army, as the guerillas called themselves, consisted of three independent units. One operated in the Aberdares Range under the command of Dedan Kimathi, another in the Mount Kenya area, and the third in Nairobi.

In 1954 the British Government brought in troop reinforcements and planes from Britain and Rhodesia. The British began to harass guerilla communications with the villages in the hope of starving them into submission. The forest areas where the guerillas hid themselves were surrounded and bombed from the air. Despite the hardships they had to endure, the guerillas fought courageously against the numerically superior enemy right up to 1956.

The commander of the African Liberation Army, Dedan Kimathi, was captured on October 21, 1956 and executed in Nairobi on February 18, 1957. The British succeeded in putting down the revolt. Official British claims put the number of Africans killed in 1952-56 at 11,500* and their own at only 167.

* Other sources put it at 30,000.

The British colonialists' bloody terror, violence and atrocities failed to break the spirit of Kenya's people. The fight for independence continued.

* * *

The national liberation movement in the French colonies of Tropical Africa also gained momentum after the war.

Before the Second World War the French possessions in West and Equatorial Africa were divided between two federations: French West Africa with eight territories (Mauritania, Senegal, Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Dahomey, the Sudan, Upper Volta and Niger) and French Equatorial Africa (the Congo, Gabon, Chad and Ubangi-Shari). Each federation had its own governor-general invested with unlimited powers. The twelve territories had their governors and ramified colonial administrations consisting of French officials and obedient local chiefs. In addition to these territories, French rule extended to the island of Madagascar and the Cameroon and Togo trust territories.

The first post-war constitutional reforms in the French colonies were purely declarative and actually did nothing to modify the colonial regime.

The French Constitution of 1946 altered the structure of colonial administration only outwardly. The term "colonial empire" was dropped in favour of the more euphonious "French Union" and the African colonies were turned into "Overseas Territories". But, as before, the French possessions in Africa remained fully dependent, economically and politically, on the metropolitan country.

In 1946-47 every territory in French West and Equatorial Africa was given a territorial assembly whose functions were confined to approving budgets and taxes and to discussing some issues of local significance. Its decisions were not binding upon the governor, who could dissolve the assembly and appoint new elections whenever it suited him. As in the past, the laws for the colonies were made and promulgated by the French Government.

In April 1947 the French Government decreed the establishment of grand councils—advisory bodies under the governors-general. Each territory sent five representatives to the Grand Council. The Grand Council of French

West Africa had forty members and the Grand Council of French Equatorial Africa twenty.

The establishment of territorial assemblies and grand councils was to a certain extent a concession to the African demands for broader political rights. But these bodies were neither really representative nor authoritative. The electoral system ensured the election of pro-French element. If the assembly submitted demands which ran counter to the French Government's interests, the colonial authorities could ignore them.

The apologists of French imperialism tried to persuade public opinion that the establishment of the French Union had put an end to French colonialism, that after the adoption of the 1946 Constitution France's relations with her colonies would be based on voluntary and equal alliance of the metropolitan country and its overseas territories. In doing this, they cited Article 80 of the Constitution: "All nationals of overseas territories are citizens, on the same basis as French nationals, of the mother country or of overseas territories." But the facts contradicted these assertions—the population of the French African colonies did not enjoy the same rights as the people in France.

The 1946 Constitution provided for the establishment of the Assembly of the French Union. But even in this purely decorative body without any authority the African countries had only 39 deputies out of 204.

The overseas territories were entitled to send representatives to the French National Assembly and the Council of the Republic, but in the former West and Equatorial Africa had 32 deputies out of 627 and in the latter 34 senators out of 320. While in France one deputy of the National Assembly represented 80,000 people, in French West Africa the figure was 850,000.

This is sufficiently clear evidence that African representation in the Assembly of the French Union and in the French Parliament was in no way equal to that of the metropolis. Economically, Madagascar and French West and Equatorial Africa continued to play the role of agrarian and raw-material appendages, a sphere of capital investment and a market for industrial goods made in France.

The 1946 Constitution could not satisfy the Africans, who were fighting for political independence. A number

of political parties emerged in the colonies after the war. There was only one prior to 1946—the Socialist Federation of Senegal—but it did not enjoy much authority among the masses. In the autumn of 1946 a group of African National Assembly deputies appealed to their countrymen in French West and Equatorial Africa to set up a mass political party. The appeal evoked a warm response in the colonies and led to the foundation of the African Democratic Rally (Rassemblement Démocratique Africain), which held its inaugural congress in Bamako (French Sudan) in October 1946. Organisationally, the RDA combined the traits of a single political party and mass organisation of the Popular Front type. It united the Africans living in different territories of French West and Equatorial Africa and helped elaborate joint demands and promote unity of action. It saw its main task in the organisation of a mass movement for the liberation of the colonies from the French imperialist yoke.

The first RDA congress rejected the 1946 Constitution as one seeking to perpetuate the inequality of the colonial countries and their dependence on metropolitan France.

In the French Parliament, the African deputies from the RDA established contact with the French Parliamentary Communist Party, the only party which consistently and staunchly supported the just demands of the Africans. Shortly after its inception the RDA got in touch with international democratic organisations and took part in the peace, youth and women's movements.

Its activities seriously perturbed the French reactionaries. The colonialists launched an assault on the revolutionary wing of the RDA, provoked bloody incidents and created pretexts to arrest the most militant leaders. In 1949 they arrested the leaders of the Democratic Party of the Ivory Coast, the most numerous section of the RDA. Reaction spared no effort to breach the close ties existing between the Rally and the progressive democratic organisations in France. It succeeded thanks to the help of its agents. In 1950 RDA President Félix Houphouet-Boigny openly attacked the French Communists and declared that his organisation was prepared to co-operate with the colonial authorities.

The activities of the Rightists led by Houphouet-Boigny split the party and undermined the unity of action. The authority the RDA had enjoyed among the masses began to decline. The local political parties, however, continued to operate in all the colonies of French West and Equatorial Africa.

In Madagascar, the national liberation movement was led by the Democratic Movement for Malagasy Renovation, a mass political party founded in 1946.

In February 1946 the Malagasy deputies in the French Constituent Assembly presented the Minister of the Colonies of the French Provisional Government with a memorandum demanding the abrogation of the 1896 treaty and the recognition of Madagascar as an independent Malagasy state. A month later they tabled a bill providing for Madagascar's independence within the framework of the French Union (with her own parliament, government and army).

What the French Government thought of these proposals may be clearly seen from the fact that the deputies of the Constituent Assembly were not even informed of this bill. And when, on April 4, Malagasy Deputy Raseta protested against the French Government's anti-constitutional act, he was called to order. The lesson the Malagasies drew was that a parliamentary struggle for independence, without a mass movement in the country, was doomed to failure.

The Malagasy people reiterated their will to independence in the election to the second French Constituent Assembly in June 1946. The results testified to the growing influence of the Democratic Movement. Despite reprisals and the arrest of many militant party members on the eve of the election, the Malagasies gave their votes to the Movement leaders Raseta and Ravoahangy.

The French colonialists resorted to their usual, well-tested methods to crush the expanding national liberation movement. One was mass repressions against prominent Democratic Movement leaders and the other an all-out attempt to split the liberation movement. In this they were helped by the Party of the Disinherited of Madagascar (Padesm), which was established under the leadership of one Ramambson in the coastal areas in July 1946. Com-

menting on the foundation of this party, the French Colonial Minister wrote to the High Commissioner in Madagascar on September 30 that the appearance of the Party of the Disinherited on the political scene would create a favourable atmosphere. Podesm was opposed to independence for Madagascar and never let a chance slip by without stressing that French rule had brought blessings to the Malagasies.

The 1946 decrees on the division of Madagascar into five provinces were also destined to break up the national liberation movement. It was not so much the question of the establishment of these provinces as the fact that each was given broad autonomy in administrative and financial affairs. The provinces also had their own assemblies. In the January 1947 elections to the provincial assemblies the colonialists did everything to get their Padesm place-men in. To do this they detained the most militant Democratic Movement members, among them many candidates, on the very eve of the elections. In the Moramanga district alone there were 450 people either under arrest or examination at the beginning of the month. Despite these measures, the Democratic Movement for Malagasy Renovation scored a big victory in Tananarive, Tamatave, Fianarantsöa and Tuléar provinces. Of the 92 seats in all the provincial assemblies it won 64.

After this fiasco the French colonial authorities decided to put an end to the national liberation movement. The pretext to start a colonial war against the Malagasy people came at the end of March when armed clashes broke out between the Malagasies and the European settlers in Moramanga, Diégo-Suarez and certain other places. The French launched on the mass repression of absolutely innocent people, massacring men, women and children without discrimination. The prisons and the concentration camps were packed to overflowing. The colonialists behaved themselves as barbarians in a conquered country, plundering and dynamiting Malagasy homes.

The Malagasies replied to this terror by forming guerrilla units and their activity won them the sympathies and support of the entire native population. It was not long before the wooded areas on the east coast were fully under their control. In June and July 1947 uprisings swept the

plateau area and several big towns, including Tamatave, Manakara and Mananjary, were cut off from the rest of the island.

The French Government rushed paratroopers, motorised units and Algerian and Senegalese riflemen to Madagascar. Nevertheless, it took two years to suppress the rising in the course of which the colonialists lost 1,000 men and the Malagasies 89,000. The regime established after that was one of ruthless terror. In April 1947 the French decreed the dissolution of the Democratic Movement for Malagasy Renovation. The deputies of the French Parliament elected by the Malagasies were deprived of immunity and arrested. The military tribunals set up in Madagascar passed many death sentences.

A widespread campaign in defence of the victims of terror was launched in France the moment the truth about the Madagascar developments became known.

On May 9, 1947, the French Parliamentary Communist Party demanded from the National Assembly to send a fact-finding mission to the island. The proposal, however, was voted down. In 1948-49 France was swept by a movement in defence of six Malagasy national liberation movement leaders, including former National Assembly deputies Raseta and Ravoahangy, who were sentenced to death on October 3, 1948. Public pressure compelled the French Government to commute the death sentences. The Malagasy leaders remained in prison until May 18, 1957, when all the participants in the 1947-48 risings were released following a nation-wide campaign for amnesty. But even after this the most prominent Madagascar political leaders, Raseta and Ravoahangy among them, were not permitted to go back to the island. They returned home only after the proclamation of Malagasy independence in 1960.

Although the 1947-48 risings were drowned in blood, the fight for Madagascar's independence flared up with renewed force in the mid-fifties. The place of the outlawed and disbanded Democratic Movement for Malagasy Renovation was taken by new political parties and organisations. It was only in December 1956 that the French Government lifted the state of emergency proclaimed in Madagascar in 1947.

Immediately after the war the national liberation movement in the British West African colonies assumed the greatest proportions in Nigeria and the Gold Coast (now Ghana).

The first national political party in Nigeria had been founded somewhat earlier, in 1944. This was the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons and it saw its main task in fighting for the abolition of the colonial regime and the proclamation of Nigeria's independence. Originally, the Council was an association of diverse political, trade union, youth and women's organisations. Later it opened its doors to individual members. The Council's ideas were propagated among the population by its newspaper, the *West African Pilot*.

The labour movement in Nigeria began to gain momentum during the war years, with the appearance of trade unions which launched a struggle for better working conditions and higher wages. The first trade union congress was held in Lagos in the summer of 1943 and was attended by 200 delegates of 56 unions with an aggregate membership of 100,000.

The first general strike in the country's history was organised by the trade unions in June 1945. The cause was the rejection of the unions' demand for higher wages to alleviate the workers' economic plight. The stoppage paralysed industry, construction work, railways and shipping. The striking workers displayed exceptional staunchness. The dispute lasted one and a half months and ended only after the colonial authorities had promised to satisfy the strikers' demands. The workers received a 50 per cent raise in wages. According to some sources, the strike involved about 150,000 workers and office employees.

The 1945 general strike was of vast importance for the Nigerian national liberation struggle. It showed that the working class was a mighty force and that without its active participation the struggle against the colonial regime was unthinkable. Little wonder, then, that the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons—an organisation of bourgeois-liberal type—sought the workers' support in its practical activities. The general strike also stimulated the trade union movement.

The Africans' growing political activity and the demand for self-government advanced by progressive organisations impelled the colonial authorities to seek for ways and means of weakening the liberation movement. The British Government hoped that constitutional reforms giving the Africans a bigger say in the administration would allay the discontent and check the movement.

Prior to the Second World War the African population of Nigeria was practically debarred from administrative bodies. The Legislative Council, an advisory body under the governor, consisted of 46 members and only ten of them were Africans. The Executive Council was 100 per cent British and it was only in 1942 that Africans were first admitted to it—two of them.

At the end of the war Governor Richards submitted to the British Government a plan for constitutional reforms, which came to be known as the Richards Constitution. What he proposed was to divide Nigeria into three administrative areas: Northern, Western and Eastern. Each would have a representative assembly with advisory functions on certain local government issues. The Nigerian Legislative Council would have 45 members, 28 of them Africans with close ties with the British administration. Despite broader African representation in the Legislative Council, the British would retain their dominant position. What is more, the Council would still be an advisory body and the governor could still veto any of its decisions. In the Executive Council (government) British predominance remained unchanged.

The new Nigerian Constitution came into force on January 1, 1947. British propaganda claimed it was a big step towards Nigerian self-government. Actually, it brought very little change to the colonial regime. In fact, in the course of the discussion of the draft constitutional reforms, the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons had sharply criticised their basic points. In March 1945 the Council published a memorandum saying the draft took no account of African interests. It came out resolutely against the appointment of Legislative Council members by the governor and demanded the conversion of the Council into a supreme organ of power elected by a popular vote. The British Government's rejection of these

modest and just demands exposed colonialist falsity and hypocrisy.

A mass movement for the revision of the Richards Constitution and for self-government swept the country in 1947. A mighty demonstration was held in Lagos on October 4, when some 30,000 people marched with streamers saying: "Down with the Richards Constitution!", "Down with imperialism!" and "Liberty or death!" The movement gradually assumed such formidable proportions that in August 1948 the British Government agreed to revise the Constitution.

In November 1949 Nigeria was rocked by workers' demonstrations and strikes in protest against the Enugu massacre. Early that month the coal miners there called a strike for higher wages. The management turned down their just demands and began to dismiss them and hire scabs. The pitmen decided not to come up. They were supported by their wives who staged several demonstrations. On November 17 the mineowners announced a lockout. On the following day, in a clash with the workers, the police opened fire on the unarmed crowd. According to an official release, eighteen people were killed and 31 wounded. Newspapers admitted, however, that the number was much greater.

The Enugu massacre evoked a storm of indignation. There were mass demonstrations in protest against the colonialists' bloody atrocities and clashes with the police. A general strike was declared on November 26. Clashes between the police and demonstrators occurred in the towns of Onitsha, Calabar, Enugu and Aba.

The wrathful protest against the Enugu massacre merged with the demand for the abolition of the colonial regime and for self-government.

The Enugu developments and the ensuing powerful anti-colonial movement compelled the British Government to hurry up with a new constitution. In January 1950 representatives of Nigeria and the British Government met for a conference in Ibadan. The Macpherson Constitution (so named after the governor of Nigeria), adopted in 1951, gave the Africans a majority in the new legislative body—the Federal House of Representatives. But, as before, it had no legislative authority because, according to

Article 81 of the Constitution, the governor alone was empowered to promulgate laws. The main African demand, for complete self-government, was rejected.

The Executive Council was reorganised into a Council of Ministers. While the Executive Council was composed of eleven Britons and four Africans, the Council of Ministers consisted of six Britons and twelve Africans. This was a concession on the part of the colonialists, but it should be borne in mind that the most important ministries (defence, finance and justice) remained in British hands.

The 1951 Constitution strengthened the position of the Nigerian separatists—a thing in line with the British "divide and rule" policy. Executive councils were formed in the Northern, Western and Eastern areas. The British hoped that the three councils would disagree on the country's development and planned to take advantage of these differences to manoeuvre and preserve their rule for a few years more.

Two more big political parties came into existence in Nigeria in 1950-51. The first—the Action Group—was founded under the chairmanship of Obafemi Awolowo in Western Nigeria in March 1950. Its leaders were against the establishment of a centralised state and declared that they would primarily demand home rule for Western Nigeria. The second—the Northern People's Congress—was established under the chairmanship of Ahmadu Bello in Northern Nigeria in 1951. This party spoke for the interests of northern feudals and was openly against Nigeria being granted immediate independence.

The establishment of these two parties undermined the African unity of action in the struggle against the colonial regime and weakened the position of the country's most progressive party, the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons.

The promulgation of the new Constitution failed to check the Nigerians' struggle for self-government. Their political struggle steadily gained in scope in 1951-53. The working class was especially active and carried out several successful strikes.

In March 1953 a demand that Nigeria be granted self-government in 1956 was raised in the Federal House of

Representatives. This demand was opposed by the Northern People's Congress. The other two parties, the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons and the Action Group, launched a wide campaign for home rule.

In the summer of 1953 the British Government was compelled to convoke a conference to revise the Macpherson Constitution. Taking advantage of the Northern feudals' opposition to the immediate abolition of the colonial regime, London succeeded in deferring the solution of this question. In March 1957, however, the Federal House of Representatives again demanded immediate independence, and this time unanimously. The colonialists' hopes to make use of the differences among the African political parties to prolong their rule proved to be in vain. In October 1958 Colonial Secretary Lennox-Boyd announced that the British Government was prepared to grant Nigeria independence on October 1, 1960. This decision was wrested from the British Government. It meant London's recognition of the Nigerian people's victory.

* * *

The first country to shatter the chains of colonialism in Tropical Africa and win political independence was the Gold Coast (now Ghana).

Prior to the Second World War British imperialism believed that its position on the Gold Coast was sufficiently strong and regarded this colony as one of its model possessions.

The war worsened the Africans' lot still more. The population suffered from an acute shortage of commodities. The colonial administration took no steps to stop European and Asian merchants from inflating prices at will. Especially bad was the plight of the workers.

The peasants were hit by another sort of disaster—the virus disease of the cacaos. To prevent it from spreading, the colonial administration ordered the destruction of all infected trees and this inflicted huge losses on the peasants for whom cocoa was the main source of income.

The bourgeois element also voiced open discontent with British colonial rule which hindered them from strengthening their position in the country's economy. The young African intelligentsia reacted painfully to the humilia-

tions and lack of rights the people had to endure. Although the colonial authorities repeatedly promised to "Africanise" the administration, the situation in the early post-war years remained unchanged. According to official data, there were between 1,300 and 1,400 appointments to senior administrative posts in April 1948, with 92 per cent of them filled by Britons and only 8 per cent by Africans.

The number of Africans in the supreme organs of colonial administration was insignificant. Prior to the war the Executive Council was 100 per cent British. The constitutional reform of 1946 gave the Africans access to the Legislative and Executive councils, but the British retained their dominant position.

The growing political activity of the Africans led in August 1947 to the establishment of the country's first political party—the United Gold Coast Convention. Its chairman was the prominent timber merchant George Grant, vice-chairman and factual leader—an Accra lawyer, Dr. Joseph Danquah, and secretary-general—Kwame Nkrumah.

One important development of the rising national liberation movement was the boycott of European goods. The campaign, begun in January 1948, aimed at forcing foreign merchants to reduce prices. It was widely supported by the population and soon spread throughout the country. The colonial authorities at first did not attach any importance to the campaign but it was not long before they were compelled to mediate between the Chamber of Commerce and the Boycott Committee. At the end of February it was announced that the parties had reached agreement on the reduction in the prices of certain imported goods. In the morning of February 28 large crowds of Africans gathered at the doors of stores and shops to see how much the prices had been reduced. The cuts proved to be insignificant and there was an outburst of indignation. On that same day demobilised servicemen were demonstrating in protest against their position. There was no direct connection between the demonstration and the boycott campaign, but the indignant crowds joined the war veterans. The authorities rushed the police to the scene. The "guardians of the law" opened fire to disperse the demonstration, killing and wounding a number of people.

The news of the massacre of peaceful demonstrators spread throughout the country and evoked a storm of wrath. In many towns disturbances continued for three or four days. The Africans were especially angry with the European, Indian and Syrian merchants, whom they regarded as directly responsible for their plight, and set out to smash their stores and shops. Fearing that the movement would spread, the colonial authorities proclaimed a state of emergency, reinforced the police in the cities, instituted strict censorship for the African press, and banned all meetings and demonstrations. The African leaders, including Dr. Danquah and Dr. Nkrumah, were taken into custody. Even according to official, patently understated figures, at least 29 people were killed and 230 wounded in the course of the February and March disturbances. The events clearly showed that, as far as the colonialists were concerned, the Gold Coast had ceased to be a "model colony".

In April 1948 the United Gold Coast Convention launched a mass campaign for home rule. The British imperialists realised that the colonial regime in its old state would lead to a revolt and that it was necessary to make some concessions, to give the Africans a bigger say in the administration. That explains their decision to set up a constitutional reform committee. The discussion of the draft of the new Constitution, elaborated with the participation of some of the leaders of the United Gold Coast Convention, revealed grave differences within the party. The Right wing, which was led by Dr. Danquah and cooperated with the Constitutional Reform Committee, wanted the British to remain in the country for several years more, thereby recognising the colonial thesis that the Gold Coast was not sufficiently mature for self-government. The Left wing, headed by Dr. Nkrumah, demanded immediate home rule and dominion status. The differences between Dr. Nkrumah's and Dr. Danquah's followers split the party. The result was the foundation of the Convention People's Party* in June 1949. It elected Dr. Nkrumah its president. The nucleus was formed by the members of the youth organisation founded by

Dr. Nkrumah in 1948—former servicemen, workers and urban artisans.

The report published by the Constitutional Committee in October 1949 showed that the reforms it proposed would actually leave the colonial regime intact. Supreme power remained in the hands of the governor. The Committee recommended the establishment of a legislative assembly of two chambers: the upper chamber of tribal chiefs and the lower chamber. Although called legislative, the assembly would have no power to legislate inasmuch as the governor retained the right of veto. He would also head the government, in which all the important posts were to be held by the British. The British Ministers would be responsible not to the Legislative Assembly but to the governor.

In short, while the Constitutional Committee's proposals were a concession on the part of the British colonialists to the growing national liberation movement, they nevertheless left the main prerogatives in British hands.

The People's Party subjected the draft Constitution to scathing criticism. The United Gold Coast Convention, on the other hand, endorsed the Committee's report and thus lost some more of its prestige among the masses.

On November 20 more than fifty organisations met for a mass rally, the Ghana People's Representative Assembly, in Accra. They adopted a resolution saying the Constitutional Committee's report had failed to justify the Africans' aspiration to self-government and demanding dominion status for the Gold Coast.

The approval of the Constitutional Committee's report by the Legislative Council on December 31 called forth a new upsurge in the movement for independence. The People's Party urged the Africans to intensify the struggle for their demands, but without resorting to violence. The most active part in this movement was played by the working class. The strike called by the railwaymen on January 8, 1950, soon became general. It paralysed the railways, the posts, telegraph and telephone, forced stores and shops in big towns to close down, and hit government institutions.

The governor proclaimed a state of emergency and banned all meetings and demonstrations. More troops

* We shall henceforth call it the People's Party.

were brought to Accra and police reinforced in other towns. The police raided the printing plant of the People's Party newspaper, the *Accra Evening News*, and closed it. Clashes between the police and demonstrators occurred in Accra and Kumasi, and both sides suffered casualties. The colonial authorities arrested the People's Party leaders, Dr. Nkrumah among them. But the national liberation movement could no longer be checked by reprisals. Although the leaders of the People's Party were in jail, its activity assumed still greater proportions. The prestige of the United Gold Coast Convention, on the other hand, was completely undermined by its leaders' collaboration with the colonialists, which became especially apparent during the municipal elections in 1950 and the election to the Legislative Assembly in February 1951.

In the latter the People's Party scored a big victory in all the major towns, winning 48 seats out of 84. Dr. Nkrumah—then in prison—contested the Accra constituency and polled 98.5 per cent of all votes.

The government, under the new Constitution, consisted of eleven Ministers, not counting the governor who presided over it. The main ministries in charge of defence, foreign affairs, finances and justice were headed by Britons; the remaining eight by Africans. Since most of the seats in the Legislative Assembly belonged to the People's Party, six of the eight African Ministers were members of this party. The governor had no choice but to release the party's leaders, and four of them, including Dr. Nkrumah, exchanged prison cells for ministerial offices.

The victory won by the People's Party in the 1951 elections was an important landmark on the road to independence. In March 1952 Dr. Nkrumah became the Prime Minister of the Gold Coast with the agreement of the British Government. Although the Gold Coast Government's rights and prerogatives remained restricted, the very fact that it was now headed by an African did much to enhance the national awareness of the oppressed people. The Africans began to demand self-government more insistently than ever and in 1952 the British Government agreed to revise the Constitution.

In June 1953 the Nkrumah Government published its proposals for a new Constitution. They provided for the

country's independence within the framework of the British Commonwealth, replacement of the three British Ministers by Africans, and an election to the Legislative Assembly (it was to consist of one chamber) on the basis of general suffrage. The governor would remain. The British Government accepted these proposals, knowing very well that it was in no position to prevent their implementation. The election to the Legislative Assembly was scheduled for June 1954.

Several new parties came into existence prior to the election campaign. One of them was the Northern People's Party, founded in April 1954, which enjoyed authority among the population of the northern areas and the support of the local chieftains. It was opposed to democratic reforms, wanted the chiefs to retain their power, and propagated separatist ideas. In Togo, the separatist element united round the Togoland Congress. The United Gold Coast Convention, which had completely lost its prestige, tried to rally the minor opposition parties. In 1952 its leaders, the above-mentioned Dr. Danquah and Dr. Kofi Busia, founded the Ghana Congress Party.

A Legislative Assembly election was held on June 15, 1954. Bearing in mind that most of the voters were illiterate, the parties chose symbols to represent them: red rooster, fish, elephant, kitchen pot, etc. Each ballot box was marked with one of these symbols and the voters dropped their ballots into the box of their choice.

The People's Party again scored a big victory. Most of the voters cast their ballots into the boxes decorated with the red rooster. The party obtained 72 seats out of 104 and this number rose to 79 when it was joined by independent deputies. The Northern People's Party won twelve seats and the Ghana Congress Party only one. Dr. Nkrumah remained at the helm of government.

Another party, the National Liberation Movement, came into being in Ashanti Province shortly after the election. Uniting the reactionary forces of the province, it proclaimed itself opposed to Dr. Nkrumah's policy and insisted on the establishment of a federal state with wide powers for the provincial governments. The party also demanded that the chiefs and the elders keep their prerogatives. In parliament it assumed the role of official

Opposition. Others to support federalism were the Northern People's Party, the Togoland Congress, the Ghana Congress Party and the Moslem Association.

In October 1954 the leaders of the National Liberation Movement sent Queen Elizabeth a letter in which they insisted on the federalisation of the Gold Coast. The People's Party resolutely rejected these separatist plans as ones playing into the hands of the colonialists. In April 1956 the Nkrumah Government published a new draft Constitution providing for the establishment of a single centralised state, to be known as Ghana, within the framework of the British Commonwealth.

The draft Constitution was discussed in the Legislative Assembly in May. The Opposition boycotted the debates and Colonial Secretary Lennox-Boyd took advantage of this to inform the House of Commons on May 11 that the question of the Gold Coast's independence could be solved only if its population definitely expressed its point of view. If the majority in the newly-elected Legislative Assembly voted for independence within the framework of the British Commonwealth, he added, the British Government would name the day.

Judging by this statement, it looked as though the British Government had its doubts about the aspirations of the Gold Coast population. The British colonialists knew very well, of course, that the Africans wanted independence, but the idea was to deter it as long as possible.

Dr. Nkrumah's Government was forced to appoint a new election to the Legislative Assembly, which was to decide on the country's independence and state structure.

The election, held in July 1956, brought the People's Party another imposing victory. It won 71 seats out of 105 (the Northern People's Party obtained fifteen and the National Liberation Movement twelve). The vote revealed that the People's Party enjoyed considerable prestige in all the provinces. Even in Ashanti, the National Liberation Movement citadel, it won eight seats out of 21, in the northern areas—eleven out of 26, and in Togoland—eight out of thirteen. The results demonstrated that the People's Party spoke for the overwhelming majority of the population. For while in 1954 its candidates polled 299,000 votes, in 1956 the figure was 398,000.

The 1956 election turned into a referendum on the Gold Coast's independence.

On September 15, replying on behalf of the British Government to the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly, Colonial Secretary Lennox-Boyd declared that it intended to proclaim that country's independence on March 6, 1957. This was a big success for the African liberation struggle.

In the country itself, however, the Nkrumah Government had to fight the separatist element seeking to dismember Ghana into a number of small states. An Opposition was knocked together in the Legislative Assembly. Consisting mainly of deputies from the Northern People's Party and the National Liberation Movement, it demanded the revision of the Constitution and guarantees to the provinces against what the Opposition leaders called "the tyranny of the Central Government".

In November these two Opposition parties demanded that the British Government grant independence to Ashanti and the northern areas. Their activity created a great many difficulties for the Nkrumah Government. By February 1957, however, the Opposition and the government had reached agreement and on the 8th of that month they published a joint draft Constitution for independent Ghana.

Basically, this meant the proclamation of Ghana's independence within the framework of the British Commonwealth. The governor-general was to stay on as a representative of the British Crown, but there would also be a government responsible to parliament. The latter, elected by popular vote for a five-year term, would be the supreme organ of legislative power. Ghana would be divided into five areas: Eastern, Western, Trans-Volta, Ashanti and Togoland. Each was to have a regional assembly elected once in three years to look after the local administration, agriculture, education, public health and other issues of local import. The Constitution secured the chiefs' powers and provided for the establishment of a chamber of chiefs. In short, some of its clauses were definitely a concession to the Opposition.

On March 6 an artillery salvo proclaimed the birth of the independent state of Ghana. To the cheers of

the population the Union Jack was lowered and in its place up went the red-yellow-green national flag of Ghana.

A few words about Togoland, which was incorporated in Ghana. After the First World War all German colonies were placed under a League of Nations mandate. Part of Togo was put under British administration, part under French. After the Second World War these two parts remained under British and French rule as trust territories. The Eves, who constituted the bulk of Togo's population, were thus divided by colonial frontiers. A mass movement for the reunion of these territories developed after the war. At the request of the Eve people this question was repeatedly discussed by the U.N. Trusteeship Council. The stand taken by the colonial powers prevented its solution. Britain put Togoland under the administration of the Gold Coast, although its political status as a trust territory was different from that of the latter.

When the question of the Gold Coast's independence came up, the Nkrumah Government proposed incorporating Togoland in Ghana. The U.N. Trusteeship Council decided to hold a plebiscite. It took place under U.N. supervision on May 9, 1956, and revealed that 58 per cent favoured union with the Gold Coast. In December of that year the U.N. General Assembly voted to cancel British trusteeship and incorporate that part of Togoland in the Gold Coast when it became independent.

The victory scored by the people of Ghana had a revolutionising effect on the other countries of Tropical Africa. It showed that any colony could achieve independence if its people fought hard enough for it. The national liberation movement in Tropical Africa continued to grow in scope in 1957. The anti-colonial front was joined by the peoples of the Belgian and Portuguese colonies who had thereto displayed very little political activity; in the French colonies the demand for independence became more insistent and vocal.

* * *

The spread of the national liberation movement compelled the French Government to undertake new constitutional reforms. The laws promulgated in 1956 and 1957

somewhat altered the structure of the colonial administration.

One important innovation was the establishment of government councils elected by the territorial assemblies of French West and Equatorial Africa. These councils were composed of Africans but were presided over by French governors right up to the summer of 1958. The reform increased the number of colonies in French Tropical Africa from two to twelve, each with its own local government bodies. Supreme power was vested in the high commissioners appointed by the French Government. Territorial assemblies and local governments were also established in the Togo and Cameroon trust territories. These constitutional innovations were meant to divide the colonies, sow confusion among the Africans and split the anti-imperialist front.

Like the 1946 reforms, the reforms of 1956 and 1957 merely altered the system of colonial administration, without affecting the colonies' economic structure in any way. While conceding broader political rights, French imperialism fully retained the key positions in the economy. And that was the main aim of the reforms.

A new draft Constitution was elaborated in 1958, after de Gaulle's advent to power. The de Gaulle Constitution, as it came to be known, actually wrought no changes in the colonial administration. The only things to change were some terms and names. The French Union was renamed the French-African Community* and the colonies became members of the Community. The Constitution envisaged the formation of thirteen "republics" on the territory of French West and Equatorial Africa and in Madagascar. Each was to have its own government with authority to deal with a small range of local issues. The most important—defence, finance, foreign relations and higher education—remained outside the competence of the African governments.

The supreme bodies in the French Community were the Executive Council, the Senate and the Court of Arbitration. The Executive Council consisted of the Prime Ministers of the member states of the Community, includ-

* Popularly known as the French Community.

ing the French Prime Minister, and some Ministers from the metropolitan country. France thus retained her dominant position. The Council was headed by the President of the Community (the French President).

The Community's army remained under the control of the French War Minister. Foreign affairs, finance, transport, justice, higher education and certain other issues were left in the charge of the appropriate French ministries.

The Senate exercised the functions of an advisory body under the President of the Community. Of the 284 Senators only 98 represented the colonies. The Court of Arbitration was set up to settle disputes arising among the member states.

Such was the structure of the colonial administration under de Gaulle. It introduced really nothing new into the relations between France and the colonies following the 1956-57 reforms.

The division of the French African possessions into thirteen economically and politically weak territories was a sequel to the policy of splitting the African peoples—a policy which clearly manifested itself in the reforms of 1956 and 1957.

The next step was to get the 1958 Constitution approved both in France and in the colonies. The French Government took this step, being fully convinced that it would win approval for de Gaulle's Constitution with the assistance of the colonial administration and its African placemen. And its approval would allow French imperialist propaganda to talk about the colonies' "voluntary" entry into the French-African Community.

The French colonialists' hopes to a certain extent justified themselves. By threats, bribery and blackmail the French imperialists managed to obtain favourable results. The only colony which rejected the Constitution and withdrew from the Community was Guinea.

The Autonomous Government of Guinea had abolished the power of the cantonal chiefs, the main bulwark of the colonial regime, back in 1957 and replaced it with democratic government bodies. The Democratic Party of Guinea, led by Sékou Touré, enjoyed great prestige in the country. In the 1958 referendum it urged the Africans to

reject the de Gaulle Constitution. This resolute step evoked widespread response and the overwhelming majority of the Guineans said No to the new Constitution.

On October 2, immediately after the referendum, the government announced Guinea's withdrawal from the French Community.

Guinea thus became the first French colony in Tropical Africa to gain independence.

The proclamation of Guinea's independence showed that the French manoeuvres, like the British, were doomed to failure. The Republic of Guinea set an inspiring example to the other French colonies and paved the way to the collapse of the French colonial empire in Tropical Africa.

Chapter IV NEW INDEPENDENT STATES

GROWING AFRICAN SOLIDARITY

The achievement of independence by Ghana and Guinea made the Africans more confident than ever that there was a possibility of putting an end to colonialism within a few years.

The struggle against imperialist rule transcended the national frontiers and grew into an organised all-African movement. The countries which have already achieved political independence consider it their sacred duty to help those fighting against the colonial regime, for their own safety remains in jeopardy as long as the imperialists dominate a considerable part of the continent. Ghana's freedom would be meaningless if it was not linked with the total liberation of the entire continent of Africa, Dr. Nkrumah told the First All-African Peoples' Conference.

Representatives of the African countries started meeting regularly in 1958 to discuss common national liberation problems. The First All-African Peoples' Conference was held in Accra in December of that year, the second in Tunis in January 1960 and the third in Cairo in March 1961. Independent African states also began to meet for conferences. They met in Accra in April 1958, in Monrovia in July and August 1959, again in Accra in April 1960, in Addis Ababa in July 1960, in Leopoldville in August 1960 and in Casablanca in January 1961. The African peoples' struggle for independence is encouraged by the fraternal solidarity of the Asian nations. The historic Bandung Conference of 1955 was followed by Afro-Asian solidarity conferences in 1959, 1960 and 1961. These international meetings helped the African countries elaborate a common plan for combating the imperialist yoke and did much to stimulate their national liberation movement.

The slogans at the First All-African Peoples' Confer-

ence were: "Peoples of Africa, unite! We have nothing to lose but our chains!" and "We must again be masters of our continent! We must achieve freedom and equality!"

In its resolution on imperialism and colonialism the conference sharply condemned racial discrimination and demanded the abolition of colonial regimes and an end to the exploitation of Africa by the imperialist powers. The conference decisions stressed that the struggle for Africa's liberty should be waged by the Africans themselves and urged the workers, the peasants, the bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia to join forces against colonialism and imperialism.

The all-African conferences devoted much attention to elaborating ways and means of strengthening political and economic independence. The First Conference of Independent African States recognised that their adherence to the imperialist economic blocs would militate against the interests of the African nations. The conference advised the African countries to co-ordinate their economic development plans and promote co-operation in order to make the best use possible of their mineral resources, build industrial enterprises, etc.

The First All-African Peoples' Conference stressed that it was necessary for the independent African states to unite to consolidate their independence and improve welfare standards. As the initial step it recommended the union of groups of states on the basis of geographical proximity, economic interdependence, and common language and culture. "Lack of unity among the states of Africa is fraught with the danger that they will become victims of imperialist intrigues and that colonialism will revive after they have achieved independence," said one of the resolutions. The conference set up a permanent secretariat and entrusted it with the task of promoting mutual understanding and unity among the African nations, speeding up the liberation of the continent, and mobilising world public opinion in support of the African peoples' fight for their political rights.

The Second All-African Peoples' Conference was held in Tunis in January 1960. The growing national liberation movement led to the replacement of the demand for independence within the lifetime of the present genera-

tion, raised at the Accra conference, by one for immediate independence. The Tunis conference concentrated especially on the strengthening of the trade union movement and on working-class unity of action.

The conference proposed establishing an all-African autonomous trade union centre and recommended the convocation of the Inaugural Congress of the All-African Trade Union Federation in 1960. The resolution on this score particularly emphasised the role played by the African working class in the struggle for independence, democracy and social progress.

The participants in the conference expressed their sympathy for the Algerian people's heroic struggle. In their resolution they recommended to the independent African states to recognise the Algerian Provisional Government and give it their support. One of the proposals was for the despatch of an African volunteer corps to assist the Algerians.

The growing solidarity of the African nations and the intensification of the independence struggle in each country taken separately brought major successes for the national liberation movement. The year 1960 went down in history as the Year of Africa. This was the year when seventeen independent states were born on the African continent. Colonialism was dealt another powerful blow.

DISINTEGRATION OF THE FRENCH COMMUNITY

The French colonies in Tropical Africa continued to be fully dependent on France after the promulgation of the de Gaulle Constitution. The French Government hoped to check the liberation movement by granting internal autonomy to the African countries. The establishment of small colonial "republics" was meant to bind them closer still to the metropolis. In short, it was the traditional "divide and rule" policy.

In the course of the 1958 referendum the French colonialists indulged in plain blackmail by warning the Africans that rejection of the French Constitution and withdrawal from the French Community would lead to cancellation of French subsidies and deterioration of the economic situation in the African colonies.

Guinea alone was not daunted and took the path of independent development. Instead of going bankrupt, as it was predicted, the young republic very soon improved its economic position and considerably enhanced its international prestige. The French Government's attempts to exert pressure on the former colony by refusing to recognise its independence and boycotting it economically proved futile. Guinea found good friends in the Soviet Union, Ghana and other countries who were ready to give her all possible assistance. The colonialists realised that the economic boycott would merely lose them not only political but economic influence in Guinea, and this caused the French Government to admit defeat and establish normal relations with Guinea.

Guinea's successful economic and political development convinced the colonies of the advantages of independence. And so in 1959, following her example, they stepped up the struggle for complete political independence.

The year 1960 brought about the disintegration of the so-called French-African Community. The first two to become independent, in the early half of the year, were the Cameroon and Togo trust territories.

The national liberation movement in the French Cameroons was led by the Cameroon Peoples' Union, which was founded in 1948. In April 1955 the Union's Executive Committee and the Cameroon Trade Union Federation, the Young Democratic League and the Women's Democratic Union sent the United Nations a declaration demanding that it annul trusteeship and grant the Cameroons independence. Democratic organisations sponsored demonstrations and meetings throughout the country, at which the Africans resolutely demanded an end to France's trusteeship. The French colonial authorities replied with reprisals and police terror.

On May 22, 1955, French troops opened fire on peaceful demonstrations in Duala, Yaoundé, Mbanga, Lomé and other towns. Three days later street fighting broke out between the Africans and the French forces in Duala, the country's biggest city. Colonialist terror forced the Africans to take up arms. Guerilla detachments appeared all the country over and launched a struggle for independence. The French threw planes, tanks and artillery against

the insurgents. Their armed forces, sent against the guerrillas, dealt ruthlessly with civilians, razing whole villages. Martial law was proclaimed throughout the country. The Cameroon Peoples' Union, the Young Democratic League and the Women's Democratic Union were outlawed and their most militant members jailed. Some reports put the number of victims of May terror at 5,000.

The French authorities then tried to create a semblance of satisfying the Africans' demands, established local self-government bodies and appointed elections to the Legislative Assembly, which was to replace the Territorial Assembly. This reform, however, did little to alter the colonial regime, for it left power in the hands of the French-appointed high commissioner who had the right to veto any of the decisions adopted by the local government. The Africans resolutely opposed this bob-tailed reform and decided to boycott the Legislative Assembly elections scheduled for December 23, 1956. The French authorities resorted to force to make the Africans vote.

Unrest in the Cameroons continued in 1957 and the French Government rushed reinforcements, bringing the number of its troops to 30,000. A major clash between French troops and the Africans occurred in the area between Edea and Yaoundé on February 1, resulting in about 1,000 people being killed.

The French colonialists' reprisals against the Cameroonian people evoked widespread indignation among the democratic forces of the world. The First All-African Peoples' Conference proclaimed February 20, 1959, a day of solidarity with the peoples of the Cameroons. Demonstrations and meetings in their support were held on that day in many countries of Africa, Asia and Europe.

On February 20 the United Nations General Assembly met for a special session to discuss the question of granting independence to the Cameroons. The French ruling element knew that sooner or later they would have to give up their trusteeship of this country and so back in 1956 they undertook a number of administrative reforms. The Territorial Assembly was reorganised into a legislative assembly, and a local government was formed. On January 1, 1959, the Cameroons was granted internal autonomy. The government was then headed by a pro-French politi-

cian, Ahmadou Ahidjo. At the special U.N. session, the French Government declared its readiness to recognise the independence of the Cameroons. What it hoped for was that in the "independent" Cameroons it would retain its economic and political influence by relying on Ahidjo and his other placemen.

The people of the Cameroons welcomed the promise of independence; that was something they had been fighting for for years. But they wanted genuine independence, not formal. This was why they insisted on the implementation of a number of democratic measures before the proclamation of independence: immediate annulment of the decree banning the Cameroon Peoples' Union, release of all political prisoners, withdrawal of French troops, dissolution of the Legislative Assembly and elections to the National Assembly under U.N. supervision.

These demands were upheld at the U.N. General Assembly special session in February 1959 by the African states and the Soviet Union. France and her NATO allies, however, got the General Assembly to grant the Cameroons independence on January 1, 1960, without preliminary elections or political amnesty. This decision roused the ire of the democratic forces in the Cameroons. There were several serious clashes between the French armed forces and guerilla detachments, and a number of major clashes in Duala, Yaoundé and Bamileke. On December 30, 1959, the Executive Committee of the Cameroon Peoples' Union issued a statement saying that no country could really be independent if its ports and aerodromes belonged to foreigners, if its government could not freely pursue a foreign policy according with the people's interests, and if the basic social freedoms were trampled upon.

Many people came out openly against Ahidjo's Government on January 1, 1960, the day independence was proclaimed. There were armed clashes with government troops in a number of places. The masses' discontent was clearly revealed in the course of the referendum on the country's Constitution. Only 43 per cent voted for it. The rest either voted against or stayed away from the polls altogether.

On October 1, 1961, after the incorporation of the British Trust Territory of the Southern Cameroons, the Re-

public of the Cameroons was renamed the Federal Republic of the Cameroons. Ahidjo became its President and Charles Assalé its Prime Minister.

The struggle for independence in French Togo was led by the Committee of Togoland Unity headed by Sylvanus Olympio. The party was founded in 1945 and was very popular.

In 1956 Togo was proclaimed an autonomous republic. The French high commissioner, however, remained in office. As in the past, he continued to control the activities of the Government Council and the Legislative Assembly. All the former was entitled to was to decide on certain home policy issues.

In April 1959 the Togo Legislative Assembly, or the Chamber of Deputies, as it came to be known, adopted a decision to proclaim the country independent. The U.N. Trusteeship Council upheld this decision at its session on July 14. France was forced to agree to grant independence to this trust territory too. Togo's independence was proclaimed on April 27, 1960. In 1961 Sylvanus Olympio was elected President of the Republic.

* * *

After the Cameroons and Togo demands for independence were raised by all the other French colonies of Tropical Africa. The French-African Community created by the 1958 Constitution began to go to pieces.

In January 1959 representatives of Senegal, the French Sudan (now the Republic of Mali), Upper Volta and Dahomey met in Dakar (Senegal) and unanimously agreed to federate within the framework of the French Community. The four nations chose the name of the Federation of Mali in memory of the Mali Empire which existed on the territory of the West Sudan in the 12th-15th centuries.

The Mali Federation plan alarmed the French Government and the pro-French African politicians. The establishment of the federation was opposed by Hounhouet-Boigny, the leader of the African Democratic Rally, who held that the French Community should be the only centre uniting the African "republics". Under the pressure of this and other pro-French political leaders Dahomey and Upper Volta withdrew from the federation scheme.

Senegal and the Sudan, however, went on with it. The Federation of Mali came into existence in April 1959.

The new federal government demanded full political independence for the Federation of Mali. France was compelled to negotiate inasmuch as the 1958 Constitution recognised the right of the member states of the French Community to secede. The talks, lasting from January to March 1960, ended in the signing of an agreement to the effect that the Federation of Mali would be proclaimed independent on June 20 of that year.

Before giving its consent, the French Government made the other side sign a number of agreements securing its control over the country. Under these agreements the Federation of Mali recognised France's right to station troops and maintain bases on its territory and promised to remain within the franc zone and the customs union with the states formerly incorporated in French West Africa. In short, while the establishment of the federation was an important victory for the liberation movement, the French imperialists' position in the country remained pretty sound, and there was a stubborn struggle ahead for genuine independence.

The Federation of Mali (with the capital at Bamako) was short-lived. The pro-French circles in Senegal and the French Government were discontented with the line taken by Modibo Keita's Government in consolidating the country's economic independence and with its foreign policy (the Keita Government had come out in defence of the Algerian people and demanded that France immediately settle the conflict by negotiating with the Algerian Provisional Government). In August 1960 these circles staged a coup in Senegal, formed a new government, announced their withdrawal from the federation and proclaimed the Republic of Senegal (August 20). The break with Senegal was approved by an emergency congress of the Sudanese Union and on September 22 the Sudan became the independent Republic of Mali.

* * *

The regime of bloody terror established in Madagascar after the 1947-48 uprising failed to suppress the national liberation movement.

In 1957 Madagascar was granted internal autonomy along with the other French colonies and set up a government council and a representative assembly. Every province received its own provincial assembly and executive council. Although the competence of these organs of power was confined to a narrow range of local issues, their establishment inspired greater political activity among the masses and stimulated the national liberation movement. By 1958 there were already twelve political parties in the country, including the Malagasy People's Union, the Union of the Independents, the Malagasy People's Rally, the Malagasy National Front, the Social-Democratic Party of Madagascar and the Democratic-Socialist Union of Madagascar. A progressive trade union centre called FISEMA (Malagasy abbreviation for Federation of Labour Unions of Madagascar) was established in 1956.

Early in May 1958 ten of the country's twelve parties met in Tamatave for the National Independence Congress. The only parties which refused to take part in it were the Social-Democratic Party and the Democratic-Socialist Union. The congress demanded elections to the Constituent Assembly and proclamation of Madagascar's independence and set up a permanent committee to co-ordinate the activities of the member parties. It thus laid the foundation for joint action by the patriotic forces. In November 1958 six of the ten parties which attended the National Independence Congress formed the Congress for Independence Party (AKFM).

The AKFM categorically demanded full political independence for Madagascar, withdrawal from the French Community, establishment of the United Malagasy Democratic Republic, and economic development along socialist lines.

In the September 1958 referendum on the new French Constitution the majority of those taking part said Yes. The vote, however, was not really expressive of the Madagascar population's will, for only 50 per cent of the voters had gone to the polls. What is more, the men at the helm of government were pro-French and were in control of the propaganda machine. When the 1958 Constitution came into force, the Representative Assembly was replaced by the National Assembly, whose deputies included

the 90 members of the abolished provincial assemblies. The Government Council was reorganised into a Council of Ministers under Philibert Tsiranana, the leader of the Social-Democratic Party. Madagascar was renamed the Malagasy Republic. This change of name, however, did not alter the country's dependence on the metropolitan country.

Two new political groups came into existence in Madagascar in 1959—the Republican Federation (Social-Democratic Party and Democratic-Socialist Union) and the Congress for Independence Party. The former disposed of an absolute majority in the National Assembly and the government.

The Congress for Independence Party united a number of progressive parties which opposed the de Gaulle Constitution in the 1958 referendum. It was against Madagascar's entry into the French Community and for the country's complete independence and relations with France on the basis of equality. In the economic sphere, the party advocated the all-round development of the national economy. In the October 1959 municipal elections the Congress for Independence Party won most of the seats in Tananarive, Diego-Suarez and other towns.

Early in 1960 the Madagascar and French governments held negotiations on the full political independence of the Malagasy Republic. The talks ended in the signing of an agreement which was ratified by the French Parliament on June 16. The Malagasy Republic acquired full sovereignty both in domestic and foreign policy. It could now send its representatives to the United Nations, establish diplomatic relations with any state and have its own army. But just as she had done in the case of the Federation of Mali, France imposed shackling agreements which secured her strategic and economic positions in Madagascar. The French monopolies were thus ensured full control over the Malagasy economy.

The imperialists were especially careful in reserving their military rights. Under the agreement France retained her bases and her armed forces, the right to move freely throughout the island and to train and equip the Malagasy army. Madagascar remained an important NATO naval base.

The Malagasy Republic was proclaimed independent on June 26, 1960. Although this independence was of restricted character, it was a big victory for the Malagasy people who had so long fought for freedom.

The achievement of political independence by the Federation of Mali and the Malagasy Republic set off, as it were, a chain reaction in all the French colonies of Tropical Africa. The governments of these "republics" followed one another in demanding political independence within the framework of the French Community. The ensuing negotiations led in August 1960 to the proclamation of independence in Dahomey, Niger, Upper Volta, the Ivory Coast, Chad, the Central-African Republic, the Congo (with the capital at Brazzaville) and Gabon. Somewhat later, on November 27, they were joined by Mauritania.

Thus by the end of 1960 twelve colonies and two trust territories of French Tropical Africa had become independent.

To prevent the French-African Community from disintegrating completely, the French Government introduced an amendment to Article 12 of the 1958 Constitution. Originally, proclamation of independence automatically entailed the country's withdrawal from the Community, as in the case of Guinea following the 1958 referendum. The June 1960 amendment said the proclamation of independence did not necessarily imply the country's withdrawal. However, it failed to prevent the collapse of de Gaulle's house of cards. The Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, Niger and Dahomey, the four countries forming the Council of Understanding, announced their withdrawal from the Community in that same month. The Republic of Mali severed its political ties with France in September. The French-African Community, with only four countries of former Equatorial Africa, Senegal and the Malagasy Republic remaining in it, thus underwent substantial changes. The Community's Executive Council was replaced by the Council of Presidents (heads of state of member countries). The Senate was no longer in a position to exercise the functions vested in it by the Constitution and turned into an inter-parliamentary body for the exchange of views. The Court of Arbitration was actually dissolved. But although the Community has disintegrated, French

imperialism perseveres in its attempts to retain its position in the former colonies of Tropical Africa by methods of economic and political pressure.

THE CONGO LESSONS

Visitors to the Belgian pavilion at the 1958 World Fair in Brussels were asked to convince themselves of the "blessings of civilisation" allegedly brought the people of the Congo by the Belgian colonialists. Belgian propaganda sought to present the Congo as a model colony, as a bit of paradise where the Africans were enjoying high living standards and were grateful to their guardians. The reality, however, had nothing in common with this idyllic picture. The Congolese lived in conditions of ruthless political, economic and social oppression.

They had absolutely no say in the administration of their country. The supreme ruler was the governor-general appointed by the Belgian Government. The Government Council under his control was an advisory body composed of Belgian colonial officials. The Africans were disfranchised and had no representatives either in the Belgian Parliament or in the local government bodies.

The country was divided into six provinces: Leopoldville, Kivu, Kasai, Equateur, Katanga and Orientale. Each of them had a governor and a provincial council with advisory functions.

There was no widespread national liberation movement in the Congo prior to 1958. The regime in the country was one of colonial terror. The African political parties, trade unions and other mass organisations were outlawed.

After the First All-African Peoples' Conference in Accra in December 1958 the Congolese struggle for freedom assumed a mass character. Addressing a meeting on his return from the conference, Patrice Lumumba, the leader of the Congolese National Movement, said the party's main aim was to unite and mobilise the masses for the struggle for a better life and to abolish the colonial regime and the exploitation of man by man.

Early in January 1959 the colonial authorities in Leopoldville banned a meeting dedicated to the results of the Accra conference. The Africans replied with a demon-

stration at which they demanded independence. This peaceful demonstration was attacked by the police and troops with fire-arms and tear-gas bombs. Clashes between the army and the Congolese population also occurred in Luluabourg, Stanleyville, Matadi and Thysville. According to official, obviously understated figures, the January events cost 71 lives. Foreign press reports, however, said several hundred people were killed in Leopoldville alone.

The January massacres failed to strike fear in the hearts of the Congolese people. On the contrary, they only made them intensify their political activity. Although the Belgian Government stepped up reprisals against the democratic organisations, the movement assumed such wide proportions that the colonialists found it impossible to check it without making any concessions. On January 13 the Belgian Government issued a declaration promising to establish elective organs of power, abolish racial discrimination and grant the country independence. All these promises, however, were rather vague and actually set no dates.

The Congolese National Movement executive demanded independence in 1960. The Belgian Government tried to soothe the masses by implementing certain administrative reforms which, however, wrought practically no changes in the colonial regime. The Legislative Council, set up in March 1959, consisted of the Minister for Congolese Affairs (president), fourteen members of the Colonial Council (thereto an advisory body under the Belgian Government) and twelve members elected by the provincial councils (two in each province). The Legislative Council thus could not be regarded as one representing the indigenous population. It was the same old Colonial Council, only reinforced and rechristened.

The years 1959 and 1960 were decisive in the Congolese people's fight for independence. New political parties came into existence one after another. Twenty political organisations were founded in 1959 in Leopoldville alone. The most influential parties were the following.

The Congolese National Movement. Founded in 1958. President: Patrice Lumumba. Demanded the establishment of a strong independent centralised state on the territory of the Belgian Congo. Split in 1959 over differences

on the future development of the Congo and the question of tactics. The main revolutionary wing was led by Lumumba. The breakaway group led by Albert Kalonji formed its own party under the same name in November 1959. Developments showed that the Kalonji group was a devoted servitor of the imperialists and a proponent of the anti-national policy of dismembering the country.

The Association of the Bakongo (ABAKO). Founded in 1948 as a cultural and educational organisation. When the national liberation movement in Africa spread, the ABAKO began to take an active part in politics. In 1956 it raised a demand for the Congo's independence and the withdrawal of Belgian troops. The party enjoyed most authority in the Lower Congo and in the city of Leopoldville. In the 1957 municipal elections in Leopoldville Province, it won seven of the eight mayoralties. The party's leader, Joseph Kasavubu, became mayor in Dandale District. In July 1959 the ABAKO was officially reorganised into a political party. In the question of the future state structure, it advocated the establishment of several Congo states with wide internal autonomy and united within a single federation.

The Party of African Solidarity. Founded in Leopoldville Province in April 1959. Leaders: Antoine Gizenga, Cleophas Kamitatu and Pierre Mulele. Was particularly influential in Kwango and Kwilu districts.

The National Progress Party. Founded in November 1959. Main area of action: Equateur Province. Composed of many small parties previously operating independently. Its establishment was inspired by the colonialists who hoped to use it in their interests.

The Central African Regroupment (CEREA). Came into existence in Bukavu (Kivu Province) in August 1959. Leaders: Anicet Kashamura and Marcel Bisukiro. The CEREA sought to unite the people of Kivu for a struggle for the Congo's independence.

The National Confederation of Katanga (CONAKAT). Founded in 1959 with the active support of the European population in the province. Generously financed by the giant Belgian-operated Union Minière du Haut Katanga, in which a considerable part of the shares is held by British and American capitalists. Moise Tshombe, the party's

leader, made it known that it was prepared to co-operate with the Europeans. The CONAKAT's pro-Belgian orientation revealed itself most clearly in its appeal to the population of the Congo following the Belgian Government's declaration of January 13, 1959. "Our confederation," the appeal said, "urges the Congolese fully to trust the Belgian authorities.... Belgium is showing that she intends to continue with the civilising mission upon which she has set out in the heart of Africa to bring about the emancipation of the African population in the conditions of complete order, calm and dignity." Doing the bidding of its masters, the CONAKAT advanced a programme providing for the secession of Katanga, the country's richest and most industrialised province. The party is a most ardent exponent of separatism and an opponent of a strong centralised state on Congo territory.

The People's Party. Set up in 1959. Influential in the provinces of Leopoldville, Kasai and Katanga. On its inception it proclaimed that in its practical activities it would be guided by socialist principles. Chairman: Alphonse Nguvulu.

The appearance of this large number of political parties (113 different political organisations contested the first Congolese parliamentary election in May 1960) was due to the survivals of clan and tribal relationships. Quite a few of them were founded on the tribal basis and not on the basis of their members' community of political convictions, and this hindered the anti-imperialist forces from uniting and working out a single programme for fighting imperialist rule. The Belgian colonialists, who had prohibited African political organisations in the past, now began to encourage them in the hope of driving a still bigger wedge between various groups and stimulating separatist proclivities. The more parties there were in the country, the imperialists held, the more opportunities they themselves would have to manoeuvre and the easier it would be to find support for their continued domination.

The situation in the Belgian Congo remained extremely tense all through 1959. Anti-colonial manifestations occurred constantly, now in one place, now in another. Five hundred and fifty people were arrested in April 1959 in

Leopoldville. In May there was a clash between the Africans and the Europeans in Thysville, with the police opening fire on the former. The basic demands of all the political parties were for the immediate formation of a provisional Congolese government and for a referendum under U.N. control. The popularity of the Congolese National Movement and its leader, Patrice Lumumba, was growing especially fast.

The Africans' increasing political activity seriously perturbed the Belgian colonialists. In the new conditions it was clearly no longer possible to preserve their rule in the Congo with the aid of reprisals.

In August 1959 the Belgian ruling quarters began discussing measures to implement the government's January 13 declaration. After a month's visit to the Congo, M. van Hemelrijck, the Minister of the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, came to the conclusion that there was an imperative need for constitutional reforms, and even for granting the Congo independence. In this he was seconded by the governor-general of the Congo. However, the stand taken by people who were familiar with the situation in the Congo was not approved by the Belgian Government. M. van Hemelrijck was compelled to resign and was succeeded by August de Schryver.

On October 16 August de Schryver made a statement proposing the institution of a parliament and the formation of an African government, but with supreme power remaining in the hands of the Belgian Government. The granting of complete independence to the Congo was to be deferred until 1964.

The Schryver plan was rejected by the leading parties—the Congolese National Movement, the ABAKO and the African Solidarity Party. They demanded the immediate proclamation of the Congo's independence and announced their decision to boycott the parliamentary elections scheduled for December 1959.

In their drive to split the Congolese unity, the colonialists set up provincial councils headed by governors in each of the country's six provinces. The aim of this reform was to facilitate the secession of Katanga, and possibly other provinces, when the time came to grant the Congo her independence.

The steps taken by the Belgian Government were firmly resisted by the Africans. Some 24,000 workers and employees of the Otraco transport company called a strike on October 6 to back their demand for a 15 per cent increase in wages. Although this stoppage, which lasted until the 13th, was economic in character, it acquired political significance in view of the tense political situation prevailing in the country. The management at first rejected the demand, but then backed down and agreed to raise wages by 12 per cent.

The extraordinary conference of the representatives of eight political parties, convoked on October 29, reaffirmed their decision to boycott the December elections. The conference did much to unite the progressive forces in the struggle for the Congo's independence.

Meanwhile, the Belgian colonialists intensified repressions in their all-out effort to carry out the programme they had drawn up. The main blow was directed against the Congolese National Movement. The meetings it sponsored were dispersed and its leader, Patrice Lumumba, was arrested and jailed. Other progressive political leaders were also persecuted. In spite of all this, the movement for national liberation steadily gained in strength and scope.

In the end, the Belgian Government decided to convoke a round-table conference on the future of the Congo.

The conference opened in Brussels on January 20, 1960, and was attended by an African delegation of eighty, representing the Congolese National Movement, the African Solidarity Party, the ABAKO, the National Progress Party, the CONAKAT, the People's Party and other leading political organisations. On the very first day of the conference the representatives of the Congolese National Movement declared that they would not take part in the deliberations until Lumumba was released from prison and joined them in Brussels. The Belgian Government was forced to concede this demand. On January 25 Lumumba was set free and immediately left by plane for the Belgian capital.

The Brussels Round-Table Conference lasted four weeks, until February 18. Its main result was the Belgian Government's consent to grant the Congo independence on June 30, 1960.

The conference decided that from March 1 to June 30 executive power in the country would be wielded jointly by the governor-general and a six-man Congolese collegium, and in the provinces by the governor and three Congolese.

There was a lively discussion on the question of who would be the head of the future independent Congolese state. The Belgian Government proposed the Belgian King. One of the Congolese delegates, Jean Bolikango, seconded the proposal and compared the Belgian crown with an old pot which should not be discarded before a new one was bought. This brought the following retort from another Congolese delegate: "And what is one to do if the old pot is full of holes?" Since most of the African delegates categorically objected to the Belgian King being the head of state of the independent Congo, it was decided to refer the matter to the Congolese Parliament.

The discussion became especially heated when it came to the question of the independent Congo's state system. The pro-Belgian CONAKAT, upholding the interests of the mining companies, demanded Katanga's secession. The party insisted on giving the local authorities exclusive rights to exploit the mineral resources of the province. The satisfaction of this demand implied secession from the Congo of its richest province, which accounted for 8 per cent of the capitalist world's output of copper, 75 per cent of cobalt, 14 per cent of tin and 60 per cent of diamonds. Lumumba resolutely opposed these separatist trends, describing them as subversion on the part of the Belgian colonialists. The overwhelming majority of African delegates rejected the CONAKAT's demands.

Since Belgium agreed to grant the Congo independence, the next question raised by the African delegates was the withdrawal of Belgian troops. The representatives of the ABAKO proposed replacing the Belgian officers of the Congolese army with officers from neutral countries—Sweden and Switzerland. This proposal, however, was flatly rejected by the Belgian Government. It insisted upon and forced the African delegates to agree to Belgium retaining her military bases and control over the Congolese army, advancing the hypocritical motive that the latter was necessitated by the training of African officers.

The conference decided to hold a parliamentary election in the Congo in May and June and to form the country's first-ever government by July 20. The Congolese Parliament would consist of two chambers: the Chamber of Deputies (137 members) and the Senate (84 members, or fourteen from each of the six provinces). The head of state was to be elected at a joint session of the two chambers. The right to vote was guaranteed all male Congolese of 21 and over, including natives of Ruanda-Urundi living in the Congo for at least ten years. The Europeans could not elect or be elected to the Congolese Parliament. The proclamation of independence was set for June 30, 1960.

The decisions of the Brussels Round-Table Conference dealt a serious blow to the Belgian colonialists' position in the Congo. But, in making tangible concessions to the Congolese, the Belgian Government had no intention of giving up the Congo. It believed that in the circumstances the granting of independence was the only means capable of preserving Belgian influence in the country. What the imperialists banked on was that the administrative machine and the commanding personnel of the army were totally Belgian and that among the Congolese there was not a single engineer, agronomist, doctor or lawyer. The Congo, they thought, would remain in their hands even though formally proclaimed independent. But the developments proved that the Belgian colonialists had miscalculated.

The results of the conference were a big victory for the Congolese people in their courageous struggle for independence. Much support was given them in this struggle by the progressive forces all the world over, including Belgium. Particularly valuable assistance was rendered them by the Belgian working class. In a message to the Belgian workers published by the newspaper *Drapeau rouge*, the representatives of the progressive parties taking part in the Brussels conference said: "Before returning home, we consider it is our duty openly and publicly to express through this newspaper our profound gratitude to all the Belgian working people who have for years persistently fought for the Congo's independence. May they know that we shall never forget the solidarity they have displayed." The message was signed by Nguvulu, the chair-

man of the People's Party, Kashamura, the leader of the Central African Regroupment, and others.

But while toiling people everywhere welcomed the results of the Brussels conference as a natural outcome of the Africans' long-drawn-out struggle against colonialism, the imperialists took them as a heavy blow to their position in the Congo. That is why they immediately set out to torpedo its decisions. Bent on proving that without them the country would be plunged into chaos, the Belgian colonialists began to instigate tribal strife. On May 3, 1960, they provoked a clash between the Baluba and the Lulua in Leopoldville, in which five people were killed and twelve wounded.

The election to the Chamber of Deputies was held in accordance with the Brussels decisions in the latter half of May. A big victory was scored by the Congolese National Movement. It won 41 seats. The National Progress Party obtained 21, the African Solidarity Party thirteen and the ABAKO twelve. The remainder went to other parties.

The first Congolese Government—a coalition one—was formed on June 23, 1960, with Patrice Lumumba as Prime Minister. Joseph Kasavubu was elected President.

The country's independence was proclaimed at a solemn ceremony in the Congolese Parliament on June 30. The Belgian Government tried to represent this historic event as one made possible by Belgium's good will. The celebrations in Leopoldville were attended by King Baudouin and all top-ranking government leaders.

The King's speech in the Congolese Parliament reflected the Belgian imperialists' determination to preserve their rule in that country. "Do not be shy to appeal to us," he said. "We are prepared to remain near you and to help you with advice in training the specialists and civil servants you will need.... The Congo and Belgium can play a very important role provided there is mutual confidence and constructive and fruitful co-operation."

The floor was then taken by the Prime Minister of the newly-independent state and his speech created doubts in the Belgian rulers' minds. "No Congolese will ever forget that his country had been conquered," Patrice Lumumba said. Independence, he added, was not a gift of the

Belgian Government. It was won in fierce and lofty struggle "in which we endured privations, suffered, and willingly shed our blood. We waged a just struggle to put an end to the humiliating slavery we were forced into by the disgraceful regime of oppression. Our wounds are too fresh to be forgotten."

At his press conference on July 5, the Congolese Prime Minister said: "We have not achieved independence and rid ourselves of the colonial yoke to fall under the sway of others. Consequently, we shall not allow the imperialists to order us about in our country.... We reserve the right to be friends with anyone we want, as befits the principle of positive neutrality.... We shall reject any foreign aid given to camouflage imperialist intrigues."

The independent policy followed by Lumumba's Government did not suit the Belgian Government and, for that matter, the governments of other imperialist powers which exported such valuable strategic raw materials as uranium, germanium, lithium and cadmium from the Congo. The country's natural riches are exploited not only by Belgian companies, but by American, British and French too. The United States exports from Katanga the greater part of the cobalt, manganese ore, tantalum, uranium and diamonds mined there. American capital constitutes one-fourth of the total invested in the American-Belgian Forminière concern. The Rockefellers and the Morgans have investments in a number of Congolese enterprises. And there is a Ford branch in Leopoldville.

The interests of British imperialism are represented mainly by Lever's, which employs 30,000 African workers on its plantations. This company is a big producer of palm oil, rubber and cocoa. It owns vast plantations, twenty oil distilleries and enterprises processing cocoa and rubber. There are Lever establishments in Leopoldville, Kasai, Equateur and Orientale provinces. In Katanga, British capital is tied with the Union Minière du Haut Katanga through the Tanganyika Concessions, in which almost half of the shares are held by British banks.

In the Congo you will find the Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, the Banque de l'Indo-Chine and other French banks. The penetration of West German capital has intensified too in recent years. In 1959, for instance, the Deut-

sche Bank took part in setting up the Agricuiteur agricultural and industrial society in Equateur Province.

Besides economic motives, the imperialists were worried by the Lumumba Government's avowed aim of following an independent policy and promoting friendly relations with the socialist countries. The ruling element in the United States, Britain, France, Belgium and other imperialist countries were afraid they might lose their positions in the Congo. That is why the imperialist powers, led by the United States, began to hatch plots against the lawfully elected Lumumba Government immediately after the proclamation of the Congo's independence.

The imperialist plotters soon found a pretext to intervene: the developments in the Congolese army in July.

When the Congo was proclaimed independent, her armed forces consisted of 26,000 Congolese and 4,000 Belgians (paratroopers), stationed mainly at the military bases in Kamin, Kiton and Banana. The commander-in-chief, General Emile Janssens, and all the officers were Belgians. No commissions were given the Africans. The Belgian Government wanted to preserve this state of affairs after the proclamation of independence. But the Congolese soldiers refused to serve under the command of Belgian officers. Many had fought in the Second World War, had considerable military experience and were quite capable of getting along without colonial guardianship. A mutiny broke out in the army at the very beginning of July. At the Hardy Camp, near Thysville, the soldiers arrested their Belgian officers and set out for the capital. The same thing happened at the Rensdorf and Leopold camps in the outskirts of the capital. The demand was for the replacement of Belgian officers by Congolese. The Congolese Government acknowledged the justice of this demand. General Janssens was dismissed and the post was taken over by the President of the Republic. The government commissioned a number of Congolese servicemen and replaced the foreign officers. The latter were not dismissed; they were retained as technical advisers.

The Africanisation of the Congolese army was a serious blow to Belgian imperialism. Loss of control over the army inevitably led to loss of control over the country. The colonialists could not reconcile themselves to that. And

so they doffed the mask of "friendship". The Belgian Government, having made sure of the support of their NATO allies, launched armed intervention against the Congo. Its paratroops occupied the most important points in the country and set out ruthlessly to suppress the population. To justify this lawlessness, the Belgian Government spread rumours that the lives of the Europeans were in danger. Then, to disorganise the country's economy, it advised the Europeans to leave. The panic thus created led to the closure of many enterprises, institutions and stores.

After that the Belgian colonialists, supported by the United States, Britain and France, proceeded with the next step in wrecking the Lumumba Government and creating chaos in the country by inspiring a sally by the Katanga provincial government under Tshombe. Doing the bidding of his masters, this traitor proclaimed the "independence" of Katanga and refused to obey the orders of the Central Government.

The actions of the Belgian colonialists and their placemen aroused widespread indignation. Lumumba's Government severed diplomatic relations with Belgium and asked the U.N. Security Council to assist the Congo against Belgian aggression.

On July 14 the Security Council adopted by a majority vote (with Britain and France abstaining) a resolution recognising Belgian activity in the Congo as aggression. It ordered Belgium to withdraw her troops from the Congo and promised to help the Congolese Government preserve the country's territorial integrity. It was also decided to assist the Congo militarily.

The governments of Ghana, Guinea, Morocco, Ethiopia, the United Arab Republic and other countries sent 20,000 troops to aid the Congolese Government. With this imposing armed force it would not have been difficult to restore order in the Congo and consolidate the authority of her lawful government. But Dag Hammarskjöld, the U.N. Secretary-General, carrying out the instructions of the imperialist powers and ignoring the Security Council resolution, used the forces put at his disposal to assist the Lumumba Government, to overthrow it. This explains the choice of officers for the commanding posts. Of the 86 assigned to the headquarters of this U.N. force, 45 were

from Western countries committed to military blocs. And of the 710 men in the liaison and police units, 546 were citizens of Western bloc countries.

It soon became obvious that the U.N. Command, instead of helping the lawful Congolese Government, was actually encouraging the Belgian aggressors and their puppets. The Lumumba Government's repeated demands that the Security Council resolution should be implemented were ignored.

At the insistence of the Soviet Union, the Security Council again discussed the situation in the Congo on July 20-22 and reaffirmed the decision on the immediate withdrawal of Belgian troops from that country. Subsequently, the Security Council repeatedly returned to this question, but its resolutions remained on paper thanks to the manoeuvres of the imperialist powers acting through Hammarskjöld. The unseemly behaviour of the U.N. Command and the U.N. Secretary-General was exposed by Patrice Lumumba. On August 14 he wrote to Hammarskjöld: "You act as though my government, which is invested with lawful authority and is alone competent of dealing with the U.N., did not exist. The manner in which you have acted so far does nothing but retard the re-establishment of order in the republic, particularly in Katanga Province, although the Security Council has solemnly declared that the aim of the intervention was complete restoration of order in the Congo Republic."

Early in September the pro-imperialist forces set out to achieve the main aim of the plot—to overthrow Lumumba's Government. To do this they first won over President Kasavubu to their side. In the evening of September 5 he announced over the radio that the Lumumba Government had been dismissed and that Joseph Ileo, one of his own men, had been appointed Prime Minister.

This action of Kasavubu's was clearly illegal, for the Congolese Parliament was alone entitled to dismiss the government. The President's anti-constitutional measures were condemned by parliament, especially summoned for the occasion, and the Lumumba Government was given a vote of confidence. Despite this, Hammarskjöld and the U.N. Command in the Congo continued to ignore the lawful government and gave all their support to Kasavubu

and to Tshombe, Kalonji, Ileo and other of his accomplices. U.N. troops occupied the aerodromes at the disposal of the Lumumba Government and the Leopoldville broadcasting station, thus isolating it from the Congolese people and depriving it of any possibility of maintaining contact with the outer world. When the Congolese Prime Minister wanted to go to New York to attend a Security Council meeting, he was refused a plane. At the Security Council discussion of the Congo issue on September 9 Hammarskjöld came out openly against the lawful Congolese Government.

Another counter-revolutionary coup was carried out in Leopoldville on September 14, when Colonel Joseph-Désiré Mobutu, the Chief of Staff of the Congolese Army, seized power and set up a military dictatorship. This was followed by an announcement that power had been transferred to the so-called Council of General Commissioners appointed by Mobutu. Lumumba's Government was completely paralysed by the September 14 coup, while Lumumba himself practically became a prisoner of U.N. troops. A reign of tyranny and lawlessness set in. General Dayal, the U.N. Secretary-General's special representative in the Congo, wrote in his report on the situation after the establishment of Mobutu's dictatorship that the lawlessness of the soldiery had replaced the laws of the country. The threat of summary arrest, attack, exile, imprisonment, plunder and even worse loomed over the population and especially over the political leaders who were then perhaps at odds with the military group running things in the area, he said.

The American and European bourgeois press was elated. Mobutu was described as a "hero", a "strong man" who could establish "order" in the Congo. Mobutu, however, did not enjoy public support. The Congolese continued to regard the Lumumba Government as the only legitimate one. And so reaction decided to do away with the popular leader. Taking advantage of Lumumba's unsuccessful attempt to escape from detention to Orientale Province, then under the control of the lawful government, Mobutu's soldiers seized the Prime Minister and his close associates on December 1 and threw them into jail. Hammarskjöld and the U.N. Command did not come out in

defence of the head of the Congolese Government, nor demand his release. This encouraged the plotters and they decided to murder Lumumba. To put their plan through they transferred the Prime Minister and his comrades-in-arms—Joseph Okito, the Speaker of the Senate, and Maurice M'Polo, the Minister of Defence—from the Thysville Camp, not far from Leopoldville, to Katanga, where power was in the hands of Lumumba's worst enemy, Tshombe. The executioner's axe was raised over the heads of the Congolese Government leaders. And this time too Hammarskjöld and the U.N. Command took no steps to prevent the horrible crime.

The "execution" of Lumumba, Okito and M'Polo was announced on February 13, 1961.

World public opinion was shocked by their murder. Everyone who closely followed the tragic developments in the Congo entertained no doubts that the responsibility for this dastardly crime lay not only with its perpetrators but also with those who had inspired it.

The Indian newspaper *Swadhinata*, denouncing the real authors of the massacre, wrote that although Tshombe was directly responsible for the murder, he was only a tool used by Hammarskjöld to destroy this outstanding son of free Africa and that behind Hammarskjöld were the American and Belgian imperialists. In a message to Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India, N. S. Khrushchov said: "Plainly speaking, it was actually Hammarskjöld who killed Lumumba. For the murderer is not only the one who wielded the knife or the revolver. The main murderer is the one who put the weapon into his hand."

Under the pressure of indignant world public opinion, the Security Council in February 1961 set up a special commission to investigate the circumstances in which Lumumba and his associates were murdered. Its report, published in November of that same year, revealed that Lumumba, Okito and M'Polo were killed on January 17, 1961, immediately after they had been brought to a country-house near Elisabethville. The men were killed in the presence of Katangan Ministers Tshombe, Munongo and Kibwe. The commission came to the conclusion that the foul crime had been prepared in advance and that the

responsibility lay with Tshombe, Kasavubu and their close associates.

After Lumumba's tragic death the reins of the lawful Congolese Government were taken over by his comrade-in-arms, Antoine Gizenga. As the conditions in Leopoldville were abnormal, the government was compelled to move to Stanleyville, the capital of Orientale Province. The Gizenga Government, which controlled a considerable part of the Congo's territory, continued Lumumba's struggle for the unity of the Congolese state. "There is only one nation in the Congo—the Congolese," Gizenga told a press conference in Stanleyville in May 1961. "Therefore, the government will continue to work for the unity and territorial integrity of the republic." The Gizenga Government demanded that the U.N. create conditions for the normal activity of the Congolese Parliament, the only body entitled to decide the destinies of the country. Despite the opposition of Kasavubu, Tshombe, Mobutu, Ileo and other active accomplices in the anti-Lumumba plot, the firm stand of the Gizenga Government bore fruit. At the end of July the deputies of the Congolese Parliament met under the protection of U.N. troops at Lovanium University. A new coalition government was formed by Cyrille Adoula in August and Gizenga became First Deputy Prime Minister. Many followers of Patrice Lumumba entered the new government.

The Adoula Cabinet announced that its main task in the immediate future was to restore the country's unity. Speaking over Radio Leopoldville in November, the head of the new Congolese Government demanded that the Security Council take steps to put an end to attempts to wrest Katanga from the rest of the country. The Security Council promised support to the Central Congolese Government and ordered the U.N. forces in the Congo to help extend its authority to Katanga.

The U.N. drive against Tshombe's troops, launched in December, developed successfully. But when it became obvious that the days of the Tshombe regime in Katanga were numbered, the United States, Britain and France stepped in to save their placeman. The American reactionary press came out in his defence. Foreseeing the denouement, the *New York Times* had written on No-

vember 1 that the Katanga Government was pro-West and it was consequently up to the West to support and defend it.

The United States hastened to Tshombe's rescue. Edmund A. Gullion, the U.S. Ambassador to the Congo and President John F. Kennedy's personal representative, was sent to Katanga to urge Tshombe to negotiate with Adoula. Together with Gullion, Tshombe arrived at the Kiton military base in mid-December to meet the Prime Minister of the Central Government. Their talks ended in the signing of the Kiton agreement, which staved off the collapse of Tshombe's regime in Katanga. Tshombe agreed to recognise the authority of the Central Government provided the Katanga provincial parliament ratified the Kiton agreement.

Subsequent developments revealed that he had no intention of abiding by the agreement, that he had used the talks merely to bring about a ceasefire and preserve his rule in the province. The Katanga provincial parliament, after debates lasting from January 30 to February 15, 1962, formally recognised the authority of the Central Government, but insisted on broad autonomy for Katanga and on the dismissal of progressive elements from the Government and a pro-West foreign policy.

The imperialist powers and the U.N. representatives in the Congo who toe their line pursue the same aim. They also seek to strengthen the position of the reactionaries and weaken the democratic forces. That is why the U.N. representatives exerted such pressure on the Adoula Government to reach agreement with Tshombe.

In January 1962 the Adoula Government gave in to the reactionaries' demands and dismissed First Deputy Prime Minister Antoine Gizenga. He was arrested and exiled to Balabemba Island. Gizenga's arrest was carried out in disregard of elementary legal rights and represented gross violation of the Congolese Constitution which grants immunity to all parliament members. "Although I am the Minister of the Interior," Christophe Gbenye told the Congolese Parliament on February 13, 1962, "I do not know what is happening to Gizenga, for, strange as it may seem, I am not kept informed about it." The arrest of Antoine Gizenga was the result of another plot to purge the ad-

ministration of democratically-minded leaders and enhance the influence of the pro-imperialist groups.

One of the aims of the plot was to pave the way for the revision of the present Constitution to facilitate the further dismemberment of the country and extend the powers of the provincial governments.

On September 11, 1962, the U.N. Secretary-General submitted to Prime Minister Adoula a plan for the reunion of Katanga with the Congo. The U Thant plan, as it came to be known, envisaged amendments to the Constitution, even distribution of Katanga's revenue between the Central and local governments, establishment of a single Congolese army, amnesty for all political prisoners, and reorganisation of the Central Government to include CONAKAT representatives.

This plan, as one may see, provided for considerable concessions to the separatists. Tshombe, however, opposed it with might and main in his effort to preserve Katanga as an independent state with its own currency and army.

At the end of December 1962 the U.N. forces launched another offensive against Katanga and seized all the bigger towns of the province within a week. This rapid rout of Tshombe's gendarmerie merely proved once again that, had they so desired, the U.N. armed forces could have restored law and order in the country a long time ago. They had not, and the responsibility lay with the imperialist powers which went out of their way to protect Tshombe in order to preserve their privileges in the country.

The Congo has now been united, but the imperialists continue with their intrigues. The Congolese people have to be on the alert all the time to uphold the independence they had won in bitter struggle.

The political consciousness of the Congolese people, who have been through so much and acquired considerable experience in political struggle, has grown substantially since the proclamation of the Congo's independence. In his message to the people on November 29, 1961, Gizenga said: "The imperialists thought that they could destroy our national awareness by killing Lumumba, but nothing has come of it. We continue to advance along the

path paved by our national hero. We know that the path to liberation is strewn with difficulties, that it requires sacrifices and entails hardships, but it is a path to happiness. You should realise that and multiply your determination, for the goal set by Lumumba has yet to be achieved."

The Congo developments are a sad lesson not only for the Congolese but for other African peoples too.

The foul crimes perpetrated in the Congo by the colonialists have torn the mask off imperialism. The illusions have dissipated and it is becoming clear to the African peoples that they will have to wage a long and stubborn struggle to achieve genuine freedom and independence. Imperialism clings tenaciously to its economic and political positions in Africa and will not stop short of any crime to safeguard them. But there is no force capable of stopping the torrent.

ABOLITION OF COLONIAL REGIMES IN NIGERIA AND SIERRA LEONE

Despite its manoeuvres with numerous constitutional reforms, the British Government was compelled in the autumn of 1958 to set a date for Nigeria's independence.

The year 1959 in Nigeria passed in preparations for the Federal Parliament election, scheduled for December 12. The election was contested mainly by three parties: the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC), the Northern People's Congress and the Action Group.

In the Northern Region, which accounts for more than half of the population, the votes were cast chiefly for the Northern People's Congress, in the Western Region—for the Action Group nominees. NCNC candidates won in all three regions, and especially in the Eastern Region.

The Northern People's Congress became the biggest party in parliament, with 142 seats out of 312. Its success was due to the influence exerted on the peasants by the feudals. The bloc of the NCNC and the Northern Progressive Elements obtained 89 seats and the Action Group—73. The Central Government formed after the election consisted of ten representatives of the Northern People's Congress and seven representatives of the NCNC. The

Action Group became the official Opposition. The Cabinet was headed by Alhaji Balewa, one of the leaders of the Northern People's Congress. Nnamdi Azikiwe, the NCNC leader, was elected Speaker of the Senate and later appointed governor-general.

On January 16, 1960, the House of Representatives unanimously adopted a message to the British Government, reiterating the demand that Nigeria be granted independence on October 1 of that year. There was nothing left for London to do but to reaffirm its earlier statement. On October 1 the Federation of Nigeria proclaimed its independence.

* * *

Another British colony in West Africa—Sierra Leone—became independent in 1961. Constitutional reforms in this country were carried out in 1951 and 1957. The Legislative Council was reorganised into a house of representatives, and the number of African deputies was increased. Whereas the members of the Legislative Council were appointed by the governor, the House of Representatives was elected.

The first general election in Sierra Leone was held in May 1957 and was won by the People's Party which obtained 26 seats in the 39-seat House of Representatives. After the election, seven Independent deputies decided to side with the People's Party and that made its position in the House stronger still.

The country's first African government was formed by Milton Margai, the leader of the People's Party, in August 1958. Although the Margai Government was controlled by the governor, its establishment was an important step towards self-government.

In April 1960, under the pressure of the growing national liberation movement, the British Government called a new constitutional conference in London. The African delegates demanded immediate independence for Sierra Leone and London was forced to concede this demand but made the Sierra Leone Government sign a number of agreements securing British imperialism's dominant position in this country. Under these agreements, Britain retained her naval base at Freetown, while British capi-

tal remained fully in control of Sierra Leone's finances. Only one African delegate resolutely opposed the shackling terms on which Sierra Leone was to be granted independence and refused to sign the London agreement—Siaka Probyn Stevens, the Secretary-General of the People's Party.

Two months later, in July, Stevens founded a new party, the All-People's Congress, which demanded elections before the proclamation of independence in the hope that they would bring a more progressive government to power. But the British colonialists and the leaders of the ruling People's Party rejected this demand.

There were anti-government manifestations and demonstrations in support of the demand for House elections before the proclamation of independence all through the last two months of the colonial administration. The Margai Government retaliated by proclaiming a state of emergency and arresting twenty leading members of the All-People's Congress. It was in this atmosphere that Sierra Leone was proclaimed independent on April 27, 1961.

NEW INDEPENDENT STATES IN EAST AFRICA

Seven independent states came into existence in East Africa in 1960-63—the Somali Republic, Tanganyika, Uganda, Ruanda, Burundi, Kenya and Zanzibar.

Prior to the Second World War Somaliland was divided among Britain, France and Italy. After the war the anti-fascist coalition split on the question of Italian Somaliland's status. The United States, Britain and other imperialist countries wanted the U.N. to place it under Italian trusteeship for an indefinite period. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries insisted on its independence. The Soviet representatives in the United Nations stressed that Italian trusteeship was contrary to the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the Somali population. The imperialist powers, however, categorically refused to grant immediate independence to the Somalis. The Soviet delegation then proposed a definite period of trusteeship to be followed by the proclamation of independence. It was agreed to make it ten years. In December 1950 the U.N. General Assembly adopted a decision to place So-

mali under Italian trusteeship and to proclaim it an independent state in 1960.

The Italian imperialists sought to perpetuate their rule in Somali and acted as though the country were an Italian colony and not a trust territory. But their plans failed. The Somalis launched a courageous struggle for independence. The most influential party in the country was the Somali Youth League, which demanded broader political rights for the Africans and the expulsion of the Italian "trustees". Under the pressure of the growing national liberation movement, the Italian authorities were compelled to agree to the establishment of a legislative council. In the first election to this body, in February 1956, the Somali Youth League won 43 seats out of 70. The next election to the Legislative Council (1959) brought the League an even bigger victory—it obtained 83 seats out of 90.

As the date of the proclamation of independence grew nearer, the League advanced a programme for the creation of Greater Somaliland by reuniting the Somali people who had been divided when the colonialists carved up the map of Africa. The territories in question were the Somali Trust Territory, French Somaliland, British Somaliland, the northern parts of Kenya and the part of Ethiopia populated by the Somalis.

The idea of uniting the Somali Trust Territory and British Somaliland into a single independent state was greeted with enthusiasm in British Somaliland. In the Legislative Council elections in February 1960, British Somaliland's two leading political parties—the Somali National League and the United Somali Party—together obtained 32 seats out of 33. After the elections representatives of British Somaliland and the Somali Trust Territory met to discuss conditions for the union of the two territories. It was agreed that on the day of its independence the Trust Territory would be united with British Somaliland in a single state.

On June 26, 1960, British Somaliland was proclaimed independent and on July 1 it united with the former Somali Trust Territory to form a new independent state in the eastern part of Tropical Africa—the Somali Republic.

* * *

Tanganyika's independence was proclaimed at the end of 1961. Back in 1920 the League of Nations mandated this former German colony to Britain. After the Second World War it became a trust territory.

As the administering power, Britain's duty was to prepare Tanganyika for self-government. That meant the British authorities were to promote the country's national economy and train personnel to direct its economic and political development. The British Government, which regarded Tanganyika as an ordinary colony, did very little to that end.

In Tanganyika, as elsewhere, the national liberation movement intensified rapidly after the Second World War. The popular demand was for the abolition of the trusteeship and full political independence. The country's first political party—the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU)—was founded in 1954 and immediately launched a campaign for broader political rights for the indigenous population, wider representation in the Legislative Council, Legislative Council elections on the basis of universal franchise, and democratisation of self-government bodies. The main demand was for the abolition of the trusteeship regime and proclamation of independence. Addressing the U.N. Trusteeship Council in 1957, Julius Nyerere, the TANU leader, demanded that it fix a definite date for the country's independence. Later, this question was repeatedly discussed in the U.N., but the British Government invariably claimed that Tanganyika was not yet prepared for self-government and, consequently, it was not in a position to name the date.

The British colonial authorities vainly tried to check the growing national liberation movement. In 1953 the governor-general forbade civil servants to join political organisations and thus sought to prevent literate and politically conscious Africans from taking an active part in the movement.

Repressive measures were taken against the TANU and some of its members. In 1957 the British refused to register ten of the Union's branches. Nyerere was forbidden to address mass meetings; in 1958 he was haled to court for his statements.

An active role in the Tanganyika national liberation movement was played by the working class. Together with the rest of the population, it demanded immediate independence. Its struggle for better working conditions and higher wages went on unabated. The number of trade unions affiliated with the Tanganyika Federation of Labour grew year by year. The number of trade union members increased from 35,000 in 1957 to 60,000 in 1959. The unions sponsored numerous strikes. There were 114 stoppages involving 39,786 people in 1957 alone. These are impressive figures for African countries. The strike movement intensified in subsequent years. In 1960 there were 203 strikes, involving 89,500 factory and office workers. One of the biggest was the postal workers' strike which lasted 55 days, from December 23, 1959, to February 16, 1960, and ended when the strikers were promised that their demand for a raise in wages would be given thorough consideration.

A big strike was called on February 8, 1960, by 10,000 railwaymen. Almost all the African railwaymen in Dar-es-Salaam and Tanga walked out on that day. The demand was for higher wages and better working conditions. The strikers held their ground even when the East African Railway Administration threatened to fire them. On February 25 TANU leader Nyerere arranged a meeting between Kasambo Tumbo, the Secretary of the African Railwaymen's Union, and James Farquharson, the general manager of the East African Railways, and urged them to reach an agreement which would put an end to the stoppage. Nyerere's mediation, however, proved to be of no avail. The strike went on for more than two months.

In October 1960 the Dockers' Union demanded the Africanisation of the Dar-es-Salaam Port Authority by February next, warning that it would do so itself if the demand was not complied with. The Tanganyika Federation of Labour backed the dockers and only intervention by the TANU prevented the union leaders from giving immediate effect to their threat.

Then there was the strike of 1,500 African workers at the Williamson diamond mines in December 1960. The men walked out after demanding higher wages and the reinstatement of six dismissed workers.

An active part in the strike movement was played by farm labourers: there were 134 stoppages in 1960, involving 60,400 people, or 67 per cent of all strikers that year. The worst hit were the European-owned sisal plantations. In Kilosa, for instance, 7,000 workers walked out on their employers. The farm labourers' strikes in October 1960 paralysed seventeen establishments.

The economic struggle waged by the workers was complemented by the unions' political actions. In March 1961 the dockers of Dar-es-Salaam resolved not to unload cargo for Katanga and Belgian goods destined for the Congo and Ruanda-Urundi. The Tanganyika trade unions wrathfully condemned the foul murder of Africa's valiant son, Patrice Lumumba.

The struggle conducted by the Tanganyika working class for its rights was part and parcel of the popular movement for liberty. The working class became an important, and the most organised, force in the national liberation movement.

The steady growth of this movement forced the British colonialists to make concessions to the Africans and extend their political rights. Prior to the Second World War there was not a single African either in the Legislative or the Executive Council. The first Africans—three of them—were appointed to the Legislative Council in 1947. In the Executive Council the first African appeared only in 1951; in 1958 African representation was increased to three.

These two councils were merely advisory bodies under the governor. Prior to 1958 the members of the Legislative Council were nominated by the governor and not elected by the population. It was only in 1958, under the pressure of the growing national liberation movement, that the first thirty "unofficial" members of the Legislative Council were elected. The country was divided into ten constituencies and in each the voters had to return three members: African, European and Asian. This was what the British called parity representation, a policy of "partnership" and racial harmony. In reality, it was a flagrant policy of racial discrimination designed to preserve British domination in the Legislative Council. The indigenous population of Tanganyika (98.5 per cent of the total) had no more representatives than the Europeans (0.2 per

cent). What is more, the governor retained the right to appoint 34 official members.

This half-hearted reform which in no way modified the existing colonial regime did not suit the Africans at all. The struggle for independence continued to gain in scope after the elections. The TANU demanded the reorganisation of the Legislative Council, abolition of the so-called system of parity representation and election of all Council members. To secure the interests of the national minorities, it proposed reserving a certain number of seats for the Europeans and the Asians. The British Government was compelled to agree to another constitutional reform.

The election to the new Legislative Council, held in August 1960, brought a smashing victory to the TANU: it obtained 70 seats out of 71.

It was followed by the reorganisation of the government. The governor retained supreme power, but the Cabinet was now headed by an African. British colonial officials remained in charge of the defence, finance, foreign and justice ministries; the other ministries went to the Africans. Nyerere, who became Chief Minister, declared in a broadcast speech on September 3 that his government would insist on Tanganyika being granted full independence within the British Commonwealth in 1961.

In March 1961 the Tanganyika Government and Iain Macleod, the British Secretary of State for the Colonies, agreed that Tanganyika would be proclaimed independent in December.

The appearance of the independent states of Somali and Tanganyika has stimulated the liberation movement in the colonies of East and Central Africa.

* * *

The suppression of the risings of 1945 and 1949 failed to dampen the national liberation movement in Uganda. To give an idea of the political developments in this country it is necessary to describe, if only in general outline, the peculiarities of its colonial administration.

Uganda was one of the first colonies which Britain administered, as it were, indirectly, through the tradition-

al organs of power. There are still several feudal "kingdoms" in the country: Buganda, Toro, Ankolé, Bunyoro and Busoga. At the turn of the century the British Government and the rulers of these territories signed protectorate agreements which are still in force.* The biggest of these "kingdoms" is Buganda and its ruler is titled Kabaka.

The agreement signed in 1900 by the British Government and the Kabaka defined the frontiers of Buganda and provided for co-operation between the Kabaka's Government and the British colonial administration. Supreme administrative power within Buganda was exercised, and is still exercised, by the Kabaka with the assistance of the local government and the Lukiko (the traditional parliament). The local government bodies are dominated by the feudal nobility. The 1900 agreement gave the Kabaka, his family and the tribal chieftains 9,000 square miles of land. This destroyed the traditional system of land tenure which precluded private ownership of land, and led to the formation of the class of big landowners destined to become the bulwark of British colonialism. A widespread national liberation movement developed in Uganda after the Second World War and the Buganda feudals spared no effort to use the masses' struggle in their own interests. The aim they pursued was to turn the future independent Uganda into a monarchy headed by the Kabaka.

After the war, the British Government set out to implement its plan of uniting all its East African colonies into the so-called Federation of East Africa. The entire population of Uganda rose against the project. Kabaka Mutesa II, the Lukiko and all the other African organisations saw through the colonialists' effort to reinforce their position in East Africa and demanded from the British Government to renounce its federation plan. There was yet another reason why the Buganda feudals opposed the establishment of the East African federation—they were afraid of losing their authority.

In 1953 Mutesa II, supported by his government and the Lukiko, demanded from Britain to withdraw Buganda

* The agreement with the rulers of Bunyoro was signed in 1933.—Ed.

from the competence of the Colonial Office and place her under the Foreign Office, to detach Buganda from the rest of the protectorate, and to give up the East African federation idea. The British Government rejected these demands, and in November 1953 the Kabaka was exiled to Britain, where he was kept until 1955. The British Government's actions evoked vast discontent and stimulated the national liberation movement still more.

The most active participant in the struggle against British imperialism was the working class. In 1956 it set up a trade union centre—the Uganda Trades Union Congress. The number of strikes grew. In 1952 they involved 8,600 workers, in 1953—14,700, in 1955—18,300. One of the biggest was the strike for higher wages called by 10,000 sugar-cane plantation workers in Lugasi in January 1956. The authorities mobilised the police, who used fire-arms and tear-gas bombs in dispersing the demonstrating strikers and wounded five of them. The workers nevertheless obtained partial satisfaction for their demands.

Five and a half thousand of the country's 6,000 railwaymen were on strike from November 18 to December 4, 1959. They returned to their jobs only after the management had promised to discuss a wage rise with the union.

In 1955 the British Government tried to allay the masses by undertaking a constitutional reform. This reform entitled the Africans to have eighteen out of the thirty elected members of the Legislative Council. The bourgeois press eulogised this "Africanisation" of the Legislative Council. Actually, however, the British kept their dominant position, for in addition to the thirty "unofficial" members there were thirty "official" ones appointed by the governor. British colonial officials also predominated in the government: the Africans were given only three portfolios. Supreme power remained in the hands of the governor.

The election of the first African members of the Legislative Council was scheduled for October 1958. The election campaign revealed the separatist, anti-democratic trends prevailing among the ruling feudal top crust in Buganda. Fearing for their authority in the "kingdom", the Buganda feudals dominating the Lukiko and the provincial government announced that there would be no

election of five members to the Uganda Legislative Council in Buganda. The election was also boycotted by the rulers of Ankole and Busoga. As the result of the stand taken by the reactionary feudals only ten of the eighteen Africans were elected. Despite that, this first election to the Uganda Legislative Council was of major importance, for it helped mobilise the masses to fight for the country's independence. A big victory was scored by the most progressive party in the country—the Uganda National Congress (UNC), which obtained five of the ten contested seats.

The constitutional reforms of 1955 naturally could not satisfy the Africans. The political parties regarded them only as a first step towards Uganda's self-government. That is why they intensified their efforts in mobilising the masses for the independence struggle. In April 1959 the Uganda National Movement, which united a number of African organisations, sponsored a boycott of non-African goods in Buganda. There was serious unrest in many parts of the province. The police were sent to disperse meetings and demonstrations and a state of emergency was proclaimed in some areas. A regime of police terror once again set in and mass arrests of active participants in the movement became the order of the day. John Kale, a UNC leader, told a press conference in Cairo in October 1959 that the British authorities were terrorising and oppressing the population. There was no freedom of movement in Uganda, no freedom of assembly, no freedom of speech and no freedom of the press, he said. People were shot for all sorts of reasons. The colonialists had deprived the Ugandans of elementary civil and human rights.

Supplementing the policy of the whip with the policy of the carrot, the British Government in 1959 began preparations for further constitutional reforms. In December of that year it published the recommendations made by the constitutional committee. One was for the reorganisation of the Legislative Council into a national assembly with an African majority. The British Government decided to hold a fresh election to the Uganda Legislative Council in 1961.

The election campaign entailed brisker political activity among the Africans. In the latter part of June 1960 a

delegation of the Uganda People's Congress,* the country's most influential party, went to London to discuss the nature of the future constitutional changes. In a statement for the press, Milton Obote, the UPC leader and head of the delegation, said the Congress would demand independence. He also declared that his party would work for the formation of a strong national government.

The feudal elements, seeking to safeguard their positions, spared no effort to turn Uganda into a conglomerate of loosely connected federal states. In August 1960 Kabaka Mutesa II and his Prime Minister, Michael Kintu, went to London for talks with the British Government. They declared that they would never agree to the formation of a strong central government and curtailment of their rights in Buganda. What they demanded was the transformation of Uganda into a federal state, with the provincial governments retaining their broad powers.

As this demand was turned down, the Buganda Government and the Lukiko decided to boycott the Legislative Council election slated to be held in 1961.

In October 1960 the Buganda Lukiko decided to abrogate the agreements between Buganda and Britain and proclaim the province's independence on January 1, 1961. The provincial government announced that Buganda was ready to accede to independent Uganda if the latter adopted a federal system of government. The Lukiko decision remained on paper, for the Buganda Government took no steps to carry it out.

The election to the Uganda Legislative Council was held in March 1961 and brought a big victory to the Uganda People's Congress, which obtained 488,000 votes. The Democratic Party got 407,000 votes, but won 43 seats in the Council, while the UPC won only 35. The reason was that in Buganda the election was boycotted in response to a call from the government and the Lukiko. Only 5 per cent of the province's population went to the polls and that enabled the Democratic Party to obtain twenty out of 21 seats allotted Buganda in the Legislative Council.

* The UPC was formed early in 1960 by the nucleus of the Uganda National Congress and other political groups.

The government formed after the election included nine Africans, all members of the Democratic Party. The party's leader, Benedicto Kiwanuka, was made Chief Minister. Supreme power, however, remained in the hands of the governor. The regime of colonial administration prevailed, and the Africans intensified their struggle for full independence.

Another Uganda constitutional conference was held in London from September 18 to October 9, 1961.

The British Government was compelled to make further concessions. The Legislative Council was replaced by a national assembly of 82 deputies elected by direct and indirect vote, nine specially-elected deputies and the Speaker. The new Constitution vested executive power in the Cabinet, which was responsible to the National Assembly and was formed of its members. The governor retained his powers and his prerogative to deal with urgent issues in the spheres of defence, armed forces and foreign affairs.

The London conference decided to grant Uganda home rule on March 1, 1962, and full independence on October 9 of the same year.

The Buganda problem was settled as follows: it was to be a federal state with its own government and parliament (Lukiko), the latter to be elected by popular vote. In the Uganda National Assembly Buganda was allotted 21 seats to be filled by direct or indirect elections, as decided by the Lukiko. Buganda retained the right to have her own sources of revenue, police and supreme court. In short, the London conference made considerable concessions to the separatists.

The rulers of Toro, Bunyoro, Ankole and Busoga sought similar rights. The British Government, though ostensibly opposed to granting them these rights, whipped up these separatist trends to create conditions which would enable it to preserve its rule in the country.

The election to the Uganda National Assembly, held on April 25, 1962, resulted in a victory for the UPC. Thanks to the support of the Buganda deputies, the UPC enjoys a two-thirds majority in the Assembly. Its leader, Milton Obote, formed a new government. On October 9 Uganda was proclaimed independent.

* * *

Two more independent states emerged in 1962 on the Ruanda-Urundi Trust Territory.

After the First World War this former German colony was mandated by the League of Nations to Belgium and became a U.N. trust territory after the Second World War. Eighty-five per cent of the population are Bahutu, 10 per cent—Batutsi, and 5 per cent—Batwa, whose tribe is the most ancient in the country.

Supreme power in Ruanda-Urundi was in the hands of the resident-general appointed by the Belgian Government. For many years the Belgian administration relied on the support of the local chiefs, the big Batutsi landowners. The country was divided into two "kingdoms"—Ruanda and Urundi.

The two kings and the smaller chiefs were all Batutsi. The Bahutu were peasants, suffering from a double yoke—colonialist and feudal. The Batutsi, of course, are not all feudal nobles. A great many of them, especially in Urundi, are hardly better off than the Bahutu poor.

It was only in the mid-fifties that the national liberation movement sweeping the African Continent reached Ruanda-Urundi. Until then there had been no major anti-imperialist manifestations or demonstrations in the country. Then, in 1959, there emerged several political parties. The most influential in Ruanda were the Hutu Emancipation Party (PARMEHUTU), which united the Bahutu, and the National Ruandese Union (UNAR), which united Batutsi. In Urundi, the biggest were the Christian-Democratic Party (PDC), which spoke for the Bahutu, and the Unity and National Progress Party (UPRONA), which united mainly the Batutsi.

The PARMEHUTU demanded the cancellation of the privileges enjoyed by the Batutsi, abolition of the monarchy and proclamation of the republic which it wanted to remain under Belgian trusteeship for several years to come. The UNAR wanted immediate independence for Ruanda, but with the monarchy preserved. The same demand was advanced by the UPRONA. The PDC did not object to the monarchist system in Urundi, but insisted on the abolition of the feudal privileges of the Batutsi.

After the proclamation of the Congo's independence the Belgian imperialists did their best to retain their position

in Ruanda-Urundi. But while in the past they relied on the feudal Batutsi nobility, they now went out of their way to win favour with the leaders of the party representing the biggest section of the population—the Bahutu.

In December 1960 the people of Ruanda went to the polls to elect local government bodies. The election was won by the PARMEHUTU and its president, Grégoire Kayibanda, formed a provisional government. The monarchy in Ruanda was overthrown on January 28, 1961. The election to the Legislative Assembly and a referendum on the monarchy were held on September 24 of the same year. Eighty per cent voted for a republican system of government. The PARMEHUTU obtained 35 seats out of 44 in the Legislative Assembly and Kayibanda became President and Prime Minister.

In the elections to the local government bodies in Urundi, held in November 1960, victory went to the PDC. The Provisional Government there was formed by Joseph Cimpaye on January 26, 1961. Unlike in Ruanda, the political struggle between the Bahutu and the Batutsi never became tense, for the class differences between the tribes were never sharp. On September 18, 1961, the people of Urundi went to the polls to elect the Legislative Assembly. Most of the seats (58 out of 64) were won by the UPRONA. The new Legislative Assembly voted for a constitutional monarchy. Prince Louis Rwagasore, the UPRONA leader, became Prime Minister. But he did not long remain one: on October 12 he was shot and killed. The murder was undoubtedly the result of a plot concocted by the Belgian colonialists and their African place-men. The Prince had been known as a liberal progressive leader who insisted on immediate independence for Ruanda-Urundi. He was killed, said Dr. Hastings Banda, the Nyasaland national liberation movement leader, by the same kind of people who had murdered Patrice Lumumba. Prince Louis was succeeded as Prime Minister by André Muhiirwa.

Although the Belgian colonialists were ostensibly prepared to grant independence to Ruanda-Urundi, they did everything to perpetuate their rule in the country.

The Soviet representative in the U.N. Trusteeship Council resolutely insisted on abolishing the trusteeship regime

and granting Ruanda-Urundi independence. In this, the Soviet Union was supported by the Afro-Asian and other countries. On February 23, 1962, the U.N. General Assembly adopted a resolution to proclaim Ruanda-Urundi's independence in July. The resolution stressed that it was in the interest of the population for Ruanda-Urundi to remain a single state.

A conference to determine the future state structure of Ruanda-Urundi was held in Addis Ababa (Ethiopia) in April 1962. The U.N. Committee's proposal for a single federal state was rejected by both the representatives of Ruanda and the representatives of Urundi, who demanded political independence for each of these territories. It was only agreed to introduce a single currency, unite the customs services, and set up a Council of Economic Union and a joint bank.

As provided for by the U.N. General Assembly resolution, two new sovereign states—Ruanda and Burundi—were proclaimed on the territory of Ruanda-Urundi on July 1, 1962. The resolution bound Belgium to withdraw her troops from the former trust territory by August 1.

And so 30 independent states came into existence in Africa between 1956 and the end of 1963. Their peoples won political independence as a result of national anti-imperialist revolutions, carried out peacefully and otherwise under the banner of nationalism. The nationalism of the oppressed nations should not be mistaken for the nationalism of the oppressing nations. As the C.P.S.U. Programme says, "the nationalism of an oppressed nation contains a general democratic element directed against oppression, and Communists support it because they consider it historically justified at a given stage. That element finds expression in the striving of the oppressed peoples to free themselves from imperialist oppression, to gain national independence and bring about a national renaissance."

The nationalism of the oppressed nations, however, has yet another aspect, one expressing the ideology and interests of the reactionary strata of the bourgeoisie, the C.P.S.U. Programme says. In the struggle for national independence this reactionary aspect does not come to the foreground inasmuch as the bourgeoisie, along with the

entire people, is interested in abolishing the colonial regime and achieving political independence. After the achievement of independence, as the contradictions between the working people and the propertied classes grow, the reactionary section of the national bourgeoisie displays an increasing inclination to pursue a policy of conciliation towards imperialism and domestic reaction. Consequently, the young African states cannot secure real economic and political independence without first resolutely isolating the domestic reactionary forces.

* * *

We have already described how mercilessly the British colonialists quashed the anti-imperialist rising in Kenya in 1952-56. The state of emergency in this country prevailed right up to 1960. These were years of police terror, years in which all African national political parties were outlawed and tens of thousands of active freedom fighters languished in jails and concentration camps.

A new political party—Kiama Kia Muingi—came into existence early in 1958, but the colonial authorities promptly banned it on the pretext that it was the prohibited Kenya African Union in disguise. Membership in the new party entailed prison terms ranging from seven to fourteen years. According to Norman Harris, Kenya's European Minister Without Portfolio, 2,137 persons were sentenced between January 1958 and April 1959 for alleged membership in the Kiama Kia Muingi. "British policy in Kenya," Stanley Brockway, the British Labour M.P., wrote in the *Peace News*, "is inevitably arousing an anger among the African population which will create a situation of danger."

In April 1958 the British authorities in Kenya instituted legal proceedings against seven African members of the Legislative Council, charging them with plotting against the prevailing laws. The indictment said these men had urged the Africans to demand the repeal of the Constitution, which deprived them of the right to rule their own country. On the eve of the trial, the Political Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain issued a statement saying, "it is time to end this long record

of suppression and to stop this new attack." The British Communist Party urged the people to "demand the withdrawal of the prosecutions" and "the release of all Africans still under detention" and also to support the Africans' demand for universal suffrage and equal democratic rights. On May 27, the day the trial opened in Nairobi, a huge crowd gathered outside the courthouse, shouting "Freedom!" and "Down with the Constitution!" Fearing a popular outburst, the colonialists decided against passing severe sentences on the accused and merely fined them.

In March 1959 the colonial authorities struck against one of the legal progressive provincial parties, the Nairobi People's Convention Party, arresting 34 of its leaders, including the editor of the newspaper *Uhuru*, for demanding the release of Jomo Kenyatta, the national liberation movement leader. Most of them were sentenced to exile in reservations.

In the spring of that same year world public opinion was shocked to learn of the murder of eleven inmates at the Hall Concentration Camp (Coastal Strip). Investigations revealed an unseemly picture of colonial tyranny and cruelty. The guards, it was established, clubbed the prisoners to force them to work and beat them up brutally if they refused. On March 3 these beatings ended in tragedy—the death of eleven inmates.

The men directly responsible for the murder—camp commandant Sullivan and his assistants—were either retired or given mild sentences. The real culprits escaped unpunished. Legislative Council member Gikonyo Kiano was perfectly right when he said the responsibility for the death of these people lay not only with the prison guards but extended to officials holding very high posts, including the governor. And the London *Observer* wrote on May 10 that the murder of the eleven prisoners at the Hall camp in Kenya was one of the most disgraceful episodes in the many years of British administration in Africa.

An active part in the struggle against the colonial regime was played by Kenya's working class. The railwaymen's strike in November 1959 was pronouncedly political in character. Outraged by the management's policy of racial discrimination, the men demanded its African-

isation. The strikers also demanded the establishment of minimum wages and limitation of the working day. The strike, which involved 23,000 railwaymen, lasted sixteen days and was called off when the management promised to negotiate with the Kenya TUC on all the demands raised by the strikers.

The dockers of Mombasa struck in August 1960 to back their demand for higher wages. The employers' association was forced to grant it.

A mass movement for the release of the exiled Jomo Kenyatta unfolded in 1959. Although this outstanding national liberation movement leader had already served his prison term, the colonial authorities forbade him to engage in politics and exiled him to Lodwar, a desert district in Northern Province. This attempt to cut Kenyatta off from all contact with the people evoked widespread indignation. The Africans demanded his immediate release and permission to take part in the country's political life. This demand was supported by the progressive forces in Britain and the rest of the world. In April 1961, under the pressure of mass protests, the British authorities transferred Kenyatta to Maralal, closer to the capital, and then in August gave him permission to return home to Gatunda and resume his political activity. Released with him were his comrades-in-arms Achieng Oneko, Kungu Karumba, Fred Kubai and Paul Ngei.

The colonialists' policy of repressions proved to be futile. The Kenya national liberation movement gained in scope day by day. At their meetings and rallies, the Africans demanded universal suffrage in order to make the Legislative Council truly representative of the indigenous population, which constituted the overwhelming majority. The African members of the Legislative Council refused to co-operate with the government until the Africans enjoyed the majority they were entitled to. Faced with such a situation, the British Government was compelled to call a constitutional conference in London in January 1960.*

* In its effort to weaken Kenya's independence movement, the British Government carried out a series of constitutional reforms in 1954, 1956 and 1958.

Six Africans were admitted to the 56-member Kenya Legisla-

Preparations for the conference considerably stimulated the political activities of all the organisations in the country. Four new political parties came into existence in the latter half of 1959.

The most reactionary European settlers founded the Kenya United Party in August. This party, led by G. G. Briggs, came out against giving the Africans a bigger role to play in the government of the country and advanced a programme of extending provincial autonomy with a view to dividing the African freedom fighters and strengthening the settlers' position. The United Party leaders said there could be no question of granting Kenya home rule for at least fifty years. The party upheld the European settlers' landownership rights in the White Highlands and opposed admittance to this area of any Africans or other "coloureds". Lastly, it championed racial discrimination and wanted separate schools for European, Indian, Arab and African children.

In April of that year Michael Blundell, Kenya's former Minister of Agriculture, formed the New Kenya Group which was joined by most of the European and Asian members of the Legislative Council. In October the Group founded the New Kenya Party which united all the Europeans who realised that it was no longer possible to preserve British rule in its old form and advocated broader political and economic rights for the Africans. Unlike the United Party, the New Kenya Party was in favour of extending African representation in the Council and introducing universal suffrage.

These two European parties, however, agreed on the main issue—on granting Kenya independence. Both held that it should be postponed for a long time.

In their preparations for the round-table conference, the British colonialists worked to divide the Africans and help the moderates found a party on which they, the colonialists, could rely. And to a certain extent they suc-

tive Council and one to the government in 1954. In 1956 the number of African representatives in the Council was increased to eight and in 1958 to fourteen. But then the number of members in the Legislative Council in 1958 was increased to 92.

ceeded. In August the African members of the Legislative Council split into two groups. Eight of them founded the Kenya National Party and six—the Kenya Independence Movement.

The National Party was to be multiracial, but the Asian members of the Legislative Council soon resigned. The party, led by Masinde Muliro, advanced a programme of moderate reforms, believing that Kenya could not be granted self-government before 1968.

The position of the Kenya Independence Movement, headed by Oginga Odinga and Tom Mboya, was more radical. The party demanded the lifting of the state of emergency, immediate release of Kenyatta and other African leaders, home rule and universal franchise, free-of-charge transfer of land in the White Highlands to the Africans, and closure of British military bases. The colonial authorities granted registration to the Kenya National Party but denied it to the Kenya Independence Movement.

In November 1959 Kenya got a new governor, Patrick Renison, and one of the first steps he took, in January of the following year, was to lift the state of emergency. But it soon became evident that this was merely a formal act. As before, the Africans could not hold mass meetings and rallies without permission and the Kenya Government retained the right not to register any political party considered undesirable. Despite the amnesty, hundreds of innocent people continued to languish in jails and concentration camps.

In July 1960 the authorities introduced curfew, a measure typical of the state of emergency, in the Nyeri district, giving increasing disturbances—in other words, the national liberation movement—as a pretext.

Police raids on Kikuyu villages became much more frequent that summer. To justify their unlawful measures, the British authorities spread rumours about the revival of the Mau Mau secret organisation and newspapers hinted at the possibility that the state of emergency might again be proclaimed. In a broadcast speech in early September, Governor Renison tried to frighten the Africans into giving up their independence struggle. The government had a plan and the means to quash civil disobedience, he said, adding that he did not think there was anyone who en-

tertained any doubts about his using this plan and the means at his disposal. As though to corroborate this, the British Government sent troops to Kenya from Britain and Aden, and began to build a big military base near Nairobi. Britain was shifting her military bases to Kenya because she was losing her bases in the Middle East, wrote the Cairo *Al Ahram*. The new base would be used to stifle the African peoples' fight for freedom, the paper added.

The round-table Kenya constitutional conference opened in London on January 18, 1960, and was attended by all the members of the Legislative Council. The British colonialists' attempt to drive a wedge in African ranks failed dismally—the Africans came to the conference with the same demands: proclamation of independence in 1960, introduction of universal suffrage on the "one man—one vote" basis, and formation of a responsible government. These demands were firmly opposed by the two Kenyan European parties.

Colonial Secretary Macleod advanced a plan recognising the necessity of allotting the majority of seats in the Legislative Council to the Africans. It was nevertheless destined to preserve the colonial regime in Kenya for an indefinite period.

The conference ended on February 21. According to its decisions, published in a White Book, the Legislative Council would be composed of 53 elected members—33 Africans and twenty non-Africans (ten Europeans, eight Indians and two Arabs). There would also be twelve so-called national members (four Africans, four Asians and four Europeans), elected by the Council itself. Kenya would have a twelve-minister government. The four official Ministers would be appointed by the governor and the eight "unofficial" Ministers elected from among the members of the Legislative Council (four Africans, three Europeans and one Asian).

The African delegation accepted Macleod's proposal as the next stage of constitutional development but reserved the right to ask for amendments to the Constitution adopted in London later on.

The London conference decisions did not arouse much enthusiasm in Kenya, for they did not satisfy the basic de-

mands: immediate proclamation of independence and solution of the land problem.

The country's political forces went through a process of regrouping in view of the Legislative Council election scheduled for 1961.

First, in March 1960, there appeared the Kenya African National Union (KANU). It was planned to make Kenyatta, then in exile, its president, but the British authorities warned that they would not register the KANU in that case. And so James Gichuru, a former Kenya African Union leader, was elected president and Mboya secretary-general. The party united the most radical elements, demanding immediate independence.

Second, in June 1960, there emerged another political party—the Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU)—following the merger of the Kenya National Party, the Masai United Front, the Kalenjin Political Alliance, the Coast African Political Union and the Somali National Association. Kenya National Party leader Muliro was elected its president.

The European parties underwent some changes too. Most of the European settlers realised that the United Party's policy of resisting constitutional reforms was unrealistic. The bankrupt United Party was reorganised into the Kenya Coalition Party under the chairmanship of Frederick Cavendish-Bentinck. Its main demands were for the preservation of the European settlers' right to land and guarantees for the Europeans' safety. The Kenya Coalition Party became a direct successor to the United Party.

The March 1961 election created an African majority in the Legislative Council. It was won by the KANU, which obtained 460,000 votes. The KADU polled 140,000 votes, or three-odd times less. The election gave the KANU twenty seats in the Council and the KADU—fourteen seats.

After the election the governor invited the KANU leaders to join the government but they refused to co-operate with the colonial authorities while Kenyatta was detained. The governor then made a similar proposal to the KADU leaders and they agreed, although shortly before that they affirmed that they would take no part in the formation of the government until Kenyatta was released. The par-

ticipation of four Africans in the Kenya Government could not seriously affect its activity while the key positions in the country remained in British hands.

The 1960 Constitution failed to satisfy the Africans who wanted its immediate revision and demanded full independence for Kenya. In October 1960 Oginga Odinga, one of the KANU leaders, wrote: "Colonialism today is not what it was yesterday. Today we are being persuaded and not only threatened. We are promised freedom 'in the future' and told that the people of Kenya are 'not ripe' yet for freedom. But the colonialists cannot delude us, nor can they intimidate us. Our slogan is: 'Freedom without delay.' We demand recognition of the Kenya people's right to establish their national state."

In November 1961 a KANU delegation led by Kenyatta, who became the party's president on his return from exile, went to London to negotiate with Colonial Secretary Reginald Maudling. The delegates insisted on Kenya being granted independence on February 1, 1962. Maudling refused to give any assurances concerning the date, but agreed that it was necessary to convoke another constitutional conference to settle the issue.

This conference was held in London in the spring of 1962 and was attended by all the members of the Kenya Legislative Council. The talks on the country's future state system revealed sharp differences between the two leading African political parties, and no agreement could be reached. The KANU was for a centralised state with a single legislative assembly and a sovereign central government. The KADU submitted a plan for a federal state with six autonomous regions, each with its own government invested with broad powers. The KADU representatives wanted the land tenure and landownership issues to be placed under the jurisdiction of the regional governments and not under that of the Central Government, as the KANU demanded.

Agreement was nevertheless reached on the basic points of Kenya's future Constitution, notably on the establishment of a "strong" and "efficient" central government, with prerogatives extending to foreign affairs, defence, foreign trade and industrial development, and of six regional governments, with authority to deal with a wide range of

local matters. It was decided that the future parliament would consist of two chambers: the Chamber of Deputies elected by popular vote and the Upper Chamber composed of representatives from the six regions. There was no agreement, however, on the final text of the Constitution.

The conference decided on the composition of the Provisional Coalition Government, with the two leading parties each holding seven posts in it.

The government formed at the London conference was not at all sovereign. It had no Prime Minister, nor a Chief Minister, as is usually the case with governments enjoying internal autonomy. Two very important ministries—defence and justice—were headed by British officials. Supreme power remained vested in the governor.

One of the main questions for which the London conference was convoked—the date of Kenya's independence—remained unsettled. The British Government used every means at its disposal to deter it.

In the last years of their administration, the British imperialists feverishly sought for ways of perpetuating their position in Kenya. One of the most acute issues was landownership. While the Africans were starving for land, more than 80 per cent of the best land seized by the European settlers lay idle. The Africans were demanding the land they had been robbed of. There were several cases in 1961 of African peasants occupying and tilling unused land in the White Highlands. On October 13, 1961, the court at Tiki (40 kilometres from Nairobi) sentenced Kimani Gateta to ten months imprisonment for ploughing up a field owned by a European farmer, Gilbert Sovage. The latter told the judge that the accused said the land no longer lawfully belonged to him and that he, Sovage, would soon be thrown out of Kenya.

In his search for the solution of the agrarian problem, Michael Blundell, the leader of the New Kenya Party, worked out a plan envisaging the purchase of an insignificant part of the land owned by the European settlers and its distribution among well-to-do Africans. The idea of the reform was to create the so-called middle class, a stratum of rich farmers on whom the colonialists could depend. The British Government approved this plan and gave the necessary funds for its implementation.

It was originally planned to allot land to 8,000 African farmers. Later, in 1961, the plan was extended to 20,000 African families. Finally, in 1962, a new scheme was elaborated for resettling the Africans in the White Highlands. It provided for the purchase of 1,000,000 acres from European planters and their distribution among approximately 70,000 African farmers. The reform, it was estimated, would cost £27,500,000, a considerable part of which would be defrayed by the British Government. The resettlement was to take five years to complete. The land, according to the plan, was to be distributed among the Africans in big lots: some of them of as much as 300 acres.

The European planters and the farmers were quite satisfied. Under the circumstances they could not expect anything better. The reform would allow them to sell at least part of their land, which sooner or later must return to its lawful owners—the African peasants. As for the Africans, they were not over-enthusiastic about the British plan.

These measures would not solve the agrarian problem or satisfy the Africans' requirements in land. Progressive politicians had declared time and again that one of the most important tasks before the Government of independent Kenya would be the solution of the agrarian problem in the interest of the African peasants. The Africans insisted on the return of their land.

The Kenya dismemberment plans aimed at preserving British rule in the country. At the end of 1960 the British colonialists encouraged a movement for the secession of a 16-kilometre-wide Coastal Strip from Kenya. In December of that year the Coast People's Party demanded from the British Government to grant this strip independence by the end of 1961 on the pretext that the coast is formally the possession of the Sultan of Zanzibar and was leased to the British Government under the 1895 treaty. This was the reason why the Coastal Strip was a protectorate and the rest of Kenya a colony.

The fact that the British Government had suddenly thought of the 1895 treaty could be explained by the colonialists' desire to strengthen their position in this important strategic area. Realising that sooner or later Kenya

would become independent, the British imperialists wanted to retain this area with Mombasa, which is the biggest port in East Africa and a major naval base. This port and the coast are an important strategic bridgehead with the aid of which Britain could economically control not only Kenya but all the other countries of East Africa.

The Africans of Kenya wrathfully rejected attempts to dismember their country.

Elections to the Kenyan House of Representatives and Senate were held in May 1963 in accordance with the Constitution adopted by the 1962 London conference. The colonial administration did everything to prevent the Kenya African National Union from winning them. The KANU foiled reactionary plots by defeating its rivals and obtaining 64 seats in the House, or more than half. Moreover, several Independents gave it their support. Governor Malcolm MacDonald had no alternative but to ask KANU leader Jomo Kenyatta to form the country's first autonomous African government.

The KANU's election victory was of paramount importance. Firstly, it meant defeat for the separatists who had striven for the partition of Kenya into several small autonomous regions. Secondly, the formation of a one-party government robbed the British colonialists of the possibility of using inter-party differences to defer independence on the grounds that the country was not united and, consequently, not ripe for it.

Shortly after its inception, Kenyatta's Government demanded that London convene another conference to discuss the possibilities of granting Kenya independence in 1963. This conference took place in September and October 1963, and the question of the country's state structure again gave rise to heated disputes. The leaders of the Kenya African Democratic Union reiterated their demand for Kenya's division into six autonomous regions with broad powers. The KANU leaders, for their part, demanded the revision of the Constitution with a view to strengthening the authority of the Central Government. Although the British Government backed the KADU, it was finally compelled to agree to extend the powers of the Central Government. This was a major victory for Kenya's progressive forces.

The London conference also set the date for Kenya's independence. On December 12, 1963, the Union Jack in Nairobi was replaced by the flag of independent Kenya.

* * *

Zanzibar, which is made up mainly of two islands—Zanzibar and Pemba—off the east coast of Africa, has a population of 300,000. Of these, 78 per cent are Africans, 16 per cent—Arabs, and the rest—Indians and Europeans.

Its Legislative and Executive Councils were established in 1926 as advisory bodies under the British resident, and as such do not possess any real power. Their members were appointed by the Sultan on the recommendation of the resident, who headed both councils.

In 1957 the Zanzibar Legislative Council consisted of 25 members, of which only six were elected. The rest were either "official" members, that is, high colonial officials, or people appointed by the Sultan on the recommendation of the resident. The Executive Council had ten members and seven of them were high colonial officials.

The spread of the national liberation movement in Africa had its impact on Zanzibar too. This led to the foundation of two political parties, the Zanzibar Nationalist Party, which spoke for Arab interests, and the Afro-Shirazi Party, which—as its name implies—united the politically active segment of the African population. The main demand raised by both was independence. In 1959 they set up a freedom committee which demanded independence in 1960.

The British Government replied that the protectorate was not ripe for self-government, but undertook constitutional reforms to soothe the masses.

By the end of 1960 the number of elected members of the Legislative Council was increased to 22. The number of members of the Executive Council was likewise increased, by five "unofficial" and three "official" members. The latter were nominated by the resident who remained its chairman.

Although the reform had somewhat broadened African representation in the Legislative Council, the key posts in the protectorate's Government remained in the hands of the British colonialists.

The election to the new Legislative Council was fixed for January 1961. It was contested, in addition to the above-mentioned two parties, by the Zanzibar and Pemba People's Party (ZPPP), which was set up early in 1960. The results were as follows: The Afro-Shirazi Party won ten seats, the Zanzibar Nationalist Party—nine, and the ZPPP—three. Since neither of the leading parties had obtained a majority, they could not form a government, although two ZPPP members announced their support of the Nationalist Party and one of the Afro-Shirazi Party. A fresh election was set for June 1, 1961, and this time people went to vote for 23 and not 22 deputies. The election passed in a highly tense atmosphere. Interparty strife led to serious disorders and bloody clashes in which 64 people were killed and more than 360 wounded.

The results differed but little from the previous election. The Nationalist Party obtained ten seats, the Afro-Shirazi Party—ten, and the ZPPP—three. The Nationalist Party and the ZPPP formed a coalition government with Muhammed Shamte Hamadi, the ZPPP leader, as Prime Minister. Actually, however, it was run by the Nationalist Party. The new government announced that it would demand independence without delay.

The Zanzibar constitutional conference on the date of independence was held in London from March 19 to April 6, 1962. All the parties demanded it in that same year but clashed over the date for the new Legislative Council election. The Afro-Shirazi Party, for instance, wanted them before the proclamation of independence, but this was opposed by the Nationalist Party and the ZPPP.

The British Government took advantage of these differences to wreck the talks. No decision was taken about the date of Zanzibar's independence. "Whether and when it will be possible to make any further advance to that goal," Colonial Secretary Maudling told a press conference, "must depend on the success of the political leaders and people of Zanzibar in reducing the existing tensions and the differences which divide them."

The country got Britain to recognise its internal autonomy in July 1963. The local government was then formed by the Zanzibar Nationalist Party and the People's Party of Zanzibar and Pemba. These two parties had

eighteen seats in the Legislative Council as against the thirteen of the opposition Afro-Shirazi Party. All three were unanimous in their demand for independence in 1963. At the conference held at their insistence in London in September, the British Government was forced to agree to Zanzibar's independence as of December 10.

The Constitution adopted at the London conference made the islands a constitutional monarchy. However, a coup d'état a month after the proclamation of Zanzibar's independence overthrew the Sultan. The country was proclaimed a republic. A new government was formed by the Afro-Shirazi and Umma parties.

Chapter V

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COLONIALISM CONTINUES

By the end of 1963 there were already 35 independent states with an aggregate population of 230,000,000 on the political map of Africa.* Twenty million Africans, or 10 per cent of the total, still live in the conditions of disgraceful colonial regime. Human conscience can no longer reconcile itself to the preservation of a regime of slavery and humiliation in our day. The question of abolishing colonialism and granting independence to all colonial countries and peoples was raised on the initiative of the Soviet Government at the Fifteenth U.N. General Assembly. In his speech at the Assembly, Premier Khrushchov said: "The Soviet Government considers that the time has come to pose the question of the complete and final abolition of colonial rule in every shape and form so as to put an end to this shame, barbarity and savagery."

The debate on this issue was heated and stormy. The Soviet Government's proposal was warmly supported by Asian, African and Latin-American countries. The colonial powers objecting to the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples found themselves in miserable minority. On December 14, 1960, the General Assembly adopted this historic document by 89 votes with nine abstentions. The U.N. General Assembly, the Declaration says, "convinced that all peoples have an inalienable right to complete freedom, the exercise of their sovereignty and integrity of their national territory, solemnly proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end

* They include the Republic of South Africa which is, after all, a sovereign state. But the African population of this country is suffering from a ruthless colonial regime and fighting for political and social rights.

colonialism in all its forms and manifestations." The Declaration recognises that all peoples have the right freely to determine their political status and pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

By itself, however, the U.N. Declaration does not automatically bring independence to the colonial countries. This is evidenced by the bloody crimes committed by the Portuguese in Angola and other colonies, the British colonialists' resistance to the demands for independence made by a number of countries in East and Central Africa, and the preservation of the colonial regime in several French and Spanish possessions. The imperialists spare no effort to prolong their rule in the colonies and their peoples face a stubborn struggle for freedom. Independence does not come of itself, it has to be won.

The imperialist powers usually refuse to grant independence to the colonies on the grounds that they are "incapable" of ruling themselves. These allegations are false and hypocritical from start to end. The Declaration deprives the colonialists of this argument. "Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence," it says.

The countries still to have colonies in Africa are Britain, France, Spain and Portugal. South Africa's indigenous population (11,000,000) is ruthlessly oppressed. Southwest Africa, which is a U.N. trust territory, has been illegally annexed by the South African racialists and turned into a colony.

The struggle against the imperialist yoke in all these territories is gaining momentum. No one doubts now that the day is not far off when an end is put once and for all to the system of political enslavement.

THE FEDERATION OF RHODESIA AND NYASALAND

The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was set up in 1953 through the forcible union of three British dependencies in Central Africa: Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Southern Rhodesia was granted the status of "self-governing colony" back in 1923. However, it was given to the European minority (7 per

cent of the total population) and not to the indigenous population. There was not a single African either in the South Rhodesian Parliament or Government.

Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland are British protectorates but, as is well known, there is no difference between a protectorate and a colony. Before the establishment of the Federation there were only two Africans in the 23-man North Rhodesian Legislative Council, which is an advisory body under the governor, and none in the Executive Council. Both were nominated by the governor. In Nyasaland, of the eighteen members of the Legislative Council only three were Africans, and in this country too the Africans were not represented in the Executive Council. In short, the indigenous population had practically no part in the government of their countries.

The British imperialists' plan of uniting their three Central African possessions was set in motion after the war.* The main idea was to strengthen the position of the European settlers and ensure the European monopolies better conditions for exploiting the natural riches of a territory equal in size to that of Britain, France, Italy and Federal Germany taken together. The establishment of the Federation was fraught with the danger of a new racialist state on the lines of the Union of South Africa (now Republic of South Africa) appearing in Central Africa and made the Africans' struggle for independence considerably more difficult. In undertaking this step, the British Government acted in concert with the European racialists of Southern and Northern Rhodesia and paid absolutely no heed to the interests of the overwhelming majority of the indigenous population.

The question of federating the two Rhodesias and Nyasaland was discussed without the Africans. They were simply confronted with a fait accompli. A royal decree on the union of the three territories was published on June 27, 1953, and the Constitution of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland came into force at the beginning of September. The Federal Assembly was made the supreme

* Analogical plans were mooted prior to the Second World War but the British Government then thought such federation premature.

organ of legislative power. Its composition fully secured European domination: of its 35 seats only six were allotted to the Africans. More than half went to Southern Rhodesia and this further strengthened the position of the white settlers in the Federation. The government bodies headed by the governor were at first left intact in all three countries.

The first election to the Federal Assembly was held in December 1953. Of the 7,000,000 Africans only 440 went to the polls in Southern Rhodesia, three in Northern Rhodesia and none in Nyasaland. Factual power was thus vested in a federal government in which there was not a single African.

After that, the African political parties stepped up their struggle against the Federation imposed on them. Representatives of the Northern Rhodesia African National Congress told the First All-African Peoples' Conference in Accra that the Africans of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland opposed the Federation because it was meant to blot out their self-government and independence hopes and enable the reactionary white minority to retain hold of economic and political power.

The movement against the Federation was especially widespread in Nyasaland. In 1955 the British Government took a step to appease the masses and nominated another two Africans to the Legislative Council, but this, naturally, did nothing to right the situation. In 1957 the Nyasaland African National Congress demanded from the British Government to hold a referendum on whether or not the Africans wanted the Federation. The British Government knew very well what the Africans wanted even without a referendum and so Lennox-Boyd, the new Colonial Secretary, declared that there could be no question of Nyasaland's withdrawal.

London's refusal to satisfy the unanimous demand of the African population forced the latter to take more decisive action.

The November 1958 election to the Federal Assembly was preceded by the promulgation of a law increasing the number of deputies from 35 to 59 and allotting only twelve seats to the Africans. Southern Rhodesia was to have 29 seats, Northern Rhodesia—19 and Nyasaland—11.

The electoral system ensured the European settlers of Southern and Northern Rhodesia an absolute majority. The high property and education status, which deprived the overwhelming majority of the right to vote, remained in force. Some 89,000 voters were registered in the three territories and only 1,731, or 2 per cent, were Africans. The Europeans, who constituted 4 per cent of the total population, accounted for 96 per cent of voters. With such an electoral system and such composition the Assembly could not be representative of the indigenous population. And so, as in 1953, the Africans of Nyasaland and Northern and Southern Rhodesia boycotted the election.

The Federal Government, formed by Sir Roy Welensky after the election, announced that it would ask the British Government to proclaim the Federation a dominion in 1960. It also repeatedly let it be known that it considered granting broader political rights to the Africans undesirable and that it would insist on the Europeans retaining key positions in the country's economy and politics. The Federal Government's policy thus created a very serious danger for the Africans—the danger of being enslaved still more.

At the end of 1958 and the beginning of 1959 there was a whole series of mass rallies in Nyasaland at which members of the African National Congress made fiery speeches demanding withdrawal from the Federation and formation of government bodies in which the decisive role would be played by the Africans and not Europeans.

The colonial authorities resorted to repression. Early in 1959 they banned African political rallies and authorised the police to disperse demonstrations and meetings with batons and tear-gas bombs.

This terror evoked widespread indignation. At the end of February the Africans rose and captured the Fort Hill airport on the Tanganyika border. To prevent troop reinforcements being brought from other colonies, the Nyasalanders erected barricades of felled trees and disrupted communications.

On March 3 the government proclaimed a state of emergency, outlawed the African National Congress and certain other African organisations and instituted mass arrests. One thousand and four hundred people were taken into custody while the state of emergency was on. Among the

active members of the Congress thrown into jail was its leader, Dr. Hastings Banda. According to official figures, 44 Africans were killed and 70 wounded in the suppression of unrest. Aided and abetted by troops and police, the colonialists quashed the movement, but could not quash the Africans' will to freedom. The struggle for Nyasaland's withdrawal from the Federation and for independence continued.

At the end of July 1960 the British Government was compelled to negotiate with Nyasaland political organisations on broader African representation in the Legislative and Executive Councils. The African delegation was headed by Dr. Banda (who had been released from jail in the meantime), the leader of the Nyasaland African National Congress, which was renamed the Malawi* Congress Party in that same year. The African delegates insisted on universal suffrage, an African majority in the Legislative Council and the formation of an all-African government. The British Government conceded only a part of these demands.

The London conference, which ended on August 4, decided that the Nyasaland Legislative Council would have 33 members—five "official" members (British colonial officials), twenty Africans and eight non-Africans.

The reform thus gave the Africans a majority in the Legislative Council but the governor retained the right to appoint any number of additional members he deemed necessary.

The Executive Council remained an advisory body under the governor. It consisted of ten Ministers—five "official" members (British officials), three Africans and two Europeans. In other words, the number of Africans was increased by one.

After the London conference Dr. Banda declared that its decisions were merely another stage in the Nyasaland people's struggle for complete independence.

The campaign for Northern Rhodesia's withdrawal from the Federation was gaining momentum too. Under the pressure of the national liberation movement the British Government in 1958 agreed to increase the number

of Africans in the thirty-man Legislative Assembly to eight. This gave the 70,000 European settlers 22 representatives and the 2,500,000 Africans only eight. The concession did practically nothing to enhance the latter's rights. The same may be said of the Executive Council, where the number of Africans was increased from two to three.

The Northern Rhodesia African National Congress took advantage of the Legislative Council election in 1959 to propagandise its programme. Its main demand was for self-government and formation of an African government.

The colonial authorities tried to quash the national liberation movement. As in Nyasaland, they periodically proclaimed a state of emergency, banned the African political parties and repressed their leaders. In 1960 the leadership of the national liberation movement was taken over by the more radical United National Independence Party (UNIP) headed by Kenneth Kaunda.

In June of that year the governor of Northern Rhodesia invoked the security bill to outlaw the UNIP in the industrial areas. At his meeting with Kaunda, Colonial Secretary Macleod said the British Government was not prepared to revise the Constitution of Northern Rhodesia. Less than a year later, however, it was forced to change its mind.

Colonial terror in Southern Rhodesia, where the national liberation movement intensified too, was especially ruthless. The political party which rallied the Africans in the fight for independence was the Southern Rhodesia African National Congress. Just like the parties in the neighbouring territories, the Congress called for the dissolution of the Federation, broader political rights for the Africans on the basis of universal suffrage and formation of state bodies which would enable them to govern their country.

After the prohibition of the Congress the Africans founded the National Democratic Party (1960). Its leaders were soon arrested. On July 19, 1960, they were charged in Salisbury court with transgressing the law on the prohibition of political organisations. The unlawful prohibition of the National Democratic Party and the arrest and trial of its leaders evoked widespread indignation. There were mass protest meetings and demonstrations in Salis-

* Malawi are the biggest population group in Nyasaland.

bury and Bulawayo. The police used clubs, tear-gas bombs and even fire-arms to disperse the demonstrators. A regular pitch battle was fought by the police and the Africans in Bulawayo on July 24. Thirteen persons were killed and fifty wounded in the first three days of unrest in this town.

The Government of Southern Rhodesia began to persecute African militants and arrested more than 300 within a few days. Later, to allay popular discontent, they released National Democratic Party leaders Michael Mwema and Morton Malianga on bail.

On September 13, 1960, the Secretary for Commonwealth Affairs arrived in Southern Rhodesia. As he was driving to Salisbury, a huge crowd of Africans barred his way, scanning: "We want freedom!" This was the voice of the entire people. The police went into action with their batons and cleared the way for the British Minister. But neither police batons nor any other more effective weapons can perpetuate British rule in this country.

The London conference on the revision of the Constitution of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland opened on December 5, 1960. Prior to it the British Government had set up a commission under Lord Monckton and sent it to Central Africa to see what the Africans thought of the Federation. The Commission spent three months in the Federation and in October submitted a report in which it stated that the Africans were resolutely demanding its dissolution.

The African delegates of Nyasaland and Northern and Southern Rhodesia demanded broader African representation at the London Constitutional Conference. The 300,000 white settlers in these three territories were represented by fifty delegates, while the 8,000,000 Africans by only thirty. There were especially few of them on Southern Rhodesia's delegation: out of nineteen delegates only two represented the National Democratic Party, the only organisation which spoke for the Africans; the rest were either members of the government who opposed broader African participation in the country's political life, or their placemen. The European delegates, led by Federal Prime Minister Sir Roy Welensky and Southern Rhodesia Prime Minister Sir Edgar Whitehead, came out sharply against the Africans' just demands and wrecked

the conference. The African delegation had warned that it would not take part in it until the number of Africans on the Southern Rhodesia delegation was increased. It had, moreover, raised the question of establishing representative bodies speaking for African interests in Nyasaland and Northern and Southern Rhodesia.

On December 12 national liberation movement leaders Banda, Nkomo and Kaunda made a joint statement to the press in which they explained their refusal to take part in the conference. The statement said they considered useless their further presence at the conference on the Federation, which the settlers were determined to preserve despite African objections. They were convinced that the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland should be abolished and were resolved to achieve it.

Shortly after the failure of this conference the British Government convoked another to discuss constitutional reforms for Northern Rhodesia. The United National Independence Party and African National Congress representatives demanded universal suffrage, one man—one vote elections, proportional representation in the Legislative Council of each racial group, and dissolution of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

The British Government, for its part, proposed a programme of curtailed constitutional reforms providing for an insignificant increase in the number of African representatives in the Legislative Council. The electoral system suggested by the British Government left intact the property and educational status. This system gave only 72,000 Africans out of 2,500,000 the right to vote. Of the 45 seats in the Legislative Council only 15 were allotted to the Africans. In the Executive Council they were offered two posts. The leaders of the African political parties refused to discuss such reforms and on February 20, 1961, the conference broke up.

The political situation in Northern Rhodesia became more tense still after that. The United National Independence Party organised a civil disobedience campaign to force the British Government to revise the Constitution which had been adopted despite African objections. In some places the campaign transcended the bounds of passive resistance and led to armed clashes between the Afri-

cans and the colonial authorities. The unrest was especially widespread in Northern Province. British newspapers in fact characterised it as a general uprising. Fierce fighting took place on August 24 and 25 between British troops and African detachments numbering between 200 and 300 men armed with rifles, spears, bows and arrows, and axes.

The colonialists rushed reinforcements from Southern Rhodesia, banned the United National Independence Party in Northern and Luapula provinces, and prohibited its Youth League in Western Province.

In Northern and Luapula provinces British troops razed whole villages and their food stocks. The Africans were forced to flee to the jungles.

The official statement issued by the governor of Northern Rhodesia on November 1, 1961, revealed that about 3,000 Africans had been arrested in August and September, and more than 2,000 of them were tried and sentenced. At least fifty people were killed.

On September 13, 1961, under the pressure of the mass African movement, the British Government announced that it would revise Northern Rhodesia's Constitution as soon as the situation there returned to normal.

The revised Constitution of 1962 actually contained nothing new.

The election to Northern Rhodesia's new Legislative Council was held in October-December 1962. The United National Independence Party won fourteen seats, the African National Congress seven and the United Federal Party (European) sixteen. Eight seats remained vacant because the candidates failed to poll the required number of votes. For the first time in the country's history the Africans obtained a majority in the Legislative Council. The two African parties (the UNIP and the Congress) formed a coalition government. The UNIP leader became Minister for Local Government and Social Security.

The results of the election created favourable conditions for the North Rhodesian Africans' struggle for complete independence. One of the tasks of the Legislative Council, Kaunda said, was to draw up a new Constitution and vote on the withdrawal from the Federation.

The British Government also elaborated a Constitution for Southern Rhodesia, this time in co-operation with the local government. The draft was published in June 1961 and the Constitution itself came into force in the following month. The new Constitution allocates fifteen seats in the Legislative Assembly to Africans. The colonialists regard this as a major concession, for previously there was not a single African in it. The African deputies, however, still will not be able to influence the Assembly's decisions since the remaining fifty deputies are Europeans.

The Cabinet, renamed the Governor's Council, is dominated, as before, by the Europeans, for its composition is decided by the governor and the South Rhodesian Prime Minister.

The Constitution provides for the establishment of a Constitutional Council whose job it will be to decide whether the bills tabled in the Legislative Assembly accord with the Constitution. Of its eleven members, who are nominated by the governor, only two are Africans. In short, any measure militating against the interests of the European minority can be voted down if the Constitutional Council proclaims it anti-constitutional.

The South Rhodesian Government has now been given even bigger right to amend the territorial constitution. This offers the colonialists greater opportunities for pursuing their racialist policy and increases the danger of Southern Rhodesia being turned into a racialist state like South Africa.

The Africans of Southern Rhodesia are resolutely opposed to the new Constitution. Deputy chairman Malianga of the National Democratic Party declared early in June 1961: "The African population of Southern Rhodesia is determined to use all the means at its disposal to resist this fictitious Constitution, which is designed to perpetuate the hated Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland."

At its conference in October 1961, the National Democratic Party decided to boycott the Legislative Assembly election in October 1962. Its leader, Joshua Nkomo, told the conference that the Constitution "will be put into effect over our dead bodies".

Towards the end of 1961 the country was swept by a wave of meetings at which the National Democratic Party

urged the Africans to boycott the election and abstain from registering as voters. The South Rhodesian Government hit back in December by banning the party. A new party—the Zimbabwe African People's Union—was formed under the leadership of National Democratic Party leader Nkomo in January 1962. The demands raised by the Union were for the revision of the 1961 Constitution, universal suffrage and African majority in the legislative bodies. It successfully continued the campaign for the boycott of the election. On September 20, 1962, the South Rhodesian Government outlawed the Union and stepped up reprisals against the national liberation movement. The most active members of the Zimbabwe African People's Union were either jailed or exiled.

It was in this situation that the election was held in December. It was won by the reactionary Rhodesian Front, which obtained 35 seats. The United Federal Party, until then in power, won 29 seats. One seat went to an Independent.

The Zimbabwe African People's Union had urged the people to boycott the election. Its chairman had told a press conference in London: "We shall not recognise the new Constitution and shall not support it. We leaders tried to restrain the people, but the policy of persuasion has proved to be a failure. We have no alternative but to resort to violence, although we ourselves had advocated non-violent methods."

The stubborn refusal of the British Government and the South Rhodesian colonialists to satisfy the Africans' just demands have aggravated the political situation in the country. The African freedom fighters will never allow Southern Rhodesia to be turned into a racialist state.

In the British colonies in Central Africa the year 1963 was marked by a growing struggle for the abolition of the hated Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. The conference held in Southern Rhodesia under the chairmanship of Minister Richard A. Butler in the summer of 1963 admitted that the existence of the Federation was no longer possible and decided to dissolve it on December 31. This decision was a victory for the national liberation movement, the result of the courageous struggle waged by the Africans in all three territories. The dissolution of the

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland creates favourable conditions for the Africans' struggle for political independence.

The British Government had recognised Nyasaland's right to self-government within the Federation back in November 1962. This was followed by the establishment of the Legislative Assembly and the formation of an African government under Dr. Hastings Banda. Supreme power, however, remained in the hands of the British governor. The dissolution of the Federation will make it possible for Nyasaland to achieve independence in the near future.

The prospects are also bright in the case of Northern Rhodesia. The election to the North Rhodesian Legislative Council, held at the end of 1962, was won by two African political parties—the United National Independence Party and the African National Congress—and they agreed to form a coalition government with the participation of their leaders, Kenneth Kaunda and Harry Nkumbula. Northern Rhodesia's struggle for withdrawal from the Federation and for independence intensified after the formation of the African government. The UNIP memorandum of March 29, 1963, declared that if the British Government failed to give Northern Rhodesia the right to secession and a democratic Constitution, no power on earth would be able to check the growing avalanche of popular resistance. However protracted the struggle may be, "we shall fight to a victorious end", the memorandum said.

In accordance with Northern Rhodesia's new Constitution, a parliamentary election was held in January 1964. Most of the seats were won by the United National Independence Party and its leader, Kenneth Kaunda, formed a new government.

The situation in Southern Rhodesia is more complicated and tense. The parliamentary election, held in an atmosphere of terror at the end of 1962, brought to power the racialist government headed by Winston Field, the leader of the Rhodesian Front, the ultra-Right party of the white settlers. Confronted by the dissolution of the Federation, the Field Government demanded full political independence from London. The satisfaction of this de-

mand in the present conditions, when the Africans are completely debarred from the government, would mean perpetuation of the rule of the European minority and transformation of Southern Rhodesia into a racialist state like South Africa. That is why the African political parties are resolutely opposed to the immediate independence of Southern Rhodesia and insist on the prior implementation of constitutional reforms which would ensure an African majority in the legislative and executive bodies.

It is absolutely clear that attempts to establish a reactionary, fascist regime in the country will be resisted by the Africans not only in Southern Rhodesia but all over the continent. Contempt for the will of the overwhelming majority of the population is fraught with the danger of an explosion, with a serious threat to world peace. This was stressed in the resolution on Southern Rhodesia adopted at the Eighteenth U.N. General Assembly by 73 votes to two (South Africa and Portugal) with nineteen abstentions (U.S.A., France, Belgium and others). The General Assembly appealed to the British Government not to satisfy the South Rhodesian Government's demand for independence until elections are held on the basis of universal franchise. It further recommended the British Government to convene as soon as possible a conference with a view to revising the South Rhodesian Constitution and deciding on measures leading to the early proclamation of Southern Rhodesia's genuine independence. In this question of altering the situation in Southern Rhodesia, certain pressure is exerted on the British Government by the African member states of the Commonwealth.

The British Government cannot ignore world public opinion, which is demanding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples, although it is being subjected to pressure by the imperialist monopolies and Southern Rhodesia's white settlers, who are doing everything in their power to preserve their positions in the country. But however much the colonialists may manoeuvre, the people of Southern Rhodesia, like those of other African countries, will win their way through to freedom.

THE PORTUGUESE COLONIES

Portugal was one of the first European powers to seize vast territories in Africa. The population of her African possessions (22 times the size of the metropolitan country) comes to 11,500,000. The most important colonies are Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea. There is perhaps no country in the world where racial, economic and political oppression is so ruthless and inhuman as in the Portuguese dependencies. Elementary human rights there are set at naught and slave labour is rife. In one of his speeches in 1956, the governor of Mukuso District (Angola) said: "Whatever may be said, the native is becoming estranged from the Portuguese administration more and more. He eats less than he did one hundred years ago, his cultural level remains the same as in the early days of colonisation, his human dignity is trampled, and he does not look like the being whom God has created free and independent."

In 1951 the Portuguese colonies were officially renamed overseas provinces. The Portuguese Government effected this change of signboards to be able to claim that Portugal no longer had any colonies and that her overseas provinces were part and parcel of the metropolis and their inhabitants enjoyed the same rights as the Portuguese.

The 1951 reform divided the population of the Portuguese colonies into two unequal groups: the "civilised" and the "uncivilised". The former included all persons of European origin and the Africans who fulfilled the following requirements: renounced the African way of life and adopted the Portuguese, that is, gave up local traditions, customs and religion; knew how to speak, read and write Portuguese; and owned a trading establishment or had a profession bringing them an income.

The population in the Portuguese colonies was divided into "civilised" and "uncivilised" to deprive the overwhelming majority of Africans of elementary human rights, for it was only the "civilised" who were recognised as full-fledged citizens. There were only 0.3 per cent "civilised" Africans in the Portuguese colonies; the rest (99.7 per cent) were classified as "uncivilised". The colonialists forbade the latter to have political, trade union and cul-

tural organisations. Unskilled labour was all they were allowed to do.

Forced labour is widely practised. The Africans are made to grow export crops like cotton and rice and to work free of charge on road construction and repair, at state and private enterprises. Particularly widespread is so-called contract labour. Special recruiting agents, assisted by the colonial authorities, force Africans to sign contracts to work on plantations and in mines and factories owned by Europeans.

Tens and hundreds of thousands of Africans recruited in the Portuguese colonies are sent every year to work in South Africa, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, and other countries. Sale of cheap labour has become an important income item in the Portuguese state budget. Comparing forced labour with the worst kind of slavery, former Portuguese deputy Henrique Galvao wrote that in some respects the former was worse than the latter. When the native was bought as an animal, his master wanted him to remain strong as a horse or a bull. Now the native was not bought—he was merely hired for a certain fee from the state. His employer cared little if he fell ill or died, for if he did all the employer had to do was simply ask for another.

Politically, the Africans have absolutely no say in the administration of the colonies. In Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea there are legislative councils which function as advisory bodies under the governor. Their members are either nominated by the governor or elected by citizens of Portuguese birth. Of the 110 deputies in the Portuguese Parliament prior to 1961, only eight represented the overseas provinces, and even then most of them were Portuguese and not Africans.

In August 1961 the Portuguese Government abolished the system which divided the colonial population into "civilised" and "uncivilised". Actually, this did nothing to change the "status of the native population" and did not give them any rights, as the November 1961 election to the Portuguese National Assembly shows. Only 30,000 Africans, or 0.3 per cent of the colonial population, were registered as voters. In the new 120-man National Assembly the overseas territories were represented by only

23 deputies and they all were non-Africans. Such reforms clearly could not satisfy the Africans or check the growing national liberation movement.

In the Portuguese colonies, this movement was not widespread in the first ten post-war years, and journalists coined the name for them: Zone of Silence. The colonialists instituted a regime of bloody terror and quashed all signs of discontent. Reference to democracy, freedom and independence was regarded as disturbance of public order and treason. In February 1953 the population of São Tomé Island, driven to despair by hunger and forced labour, rose against the Portuguese colonialists. The local authorities ruthlessly suppressed the revolt, killing more than 1,000 people. Another massacre took place in Bissau, Portuguese Guinea, in August 1959, when European settlers and soldiers killed more than fifty Africans for daring demand a wage increase.

The upsurge of the national liberation movement on the continent had a revolutionising impact on the Portuguese colonies. The wind of freedom reached this part of Africa despite the regime of merciless terror. The political report to the Fifth Congress of the Portuguese Communist Party in 1957 declared that the peoples of the Portuguese colonies were not keeping aloof from the struggle, that they were joining it en force and were resisting the Salazar Government's colonial policy.

There are underground political parties and organisations in all Portuguese colonies. They are active both at home and abroad, seeking to draw attention to the tragic lot of the Africans enslaved by the Portuguese colonialists.

One of the first political organisations to be founded in Angola after the Second World War was a youth organisation in Luanda which did cultural and educational work among the Africans and propagandised the idea of independence. The colonial authorities banned it. After that there appeared several underground political parties which launched a struggle against the colonial regime. The first nation-wide party—the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola—was founded in December 1956. Its big national liberation programme contained demands for complete independence, establishment of a republican and

democratic system, equality for all national groups, Africanisation of the administrative apparatus, and Angola's withdrawal from the alliances and pacts into which she had been inveigled against her people's will. In the economic sphere, the programme envisaged planned economic development, elimination of the one-crop nature of agriculture, establishment and development of the state sector in industry and trade, and freedom for private enterprise. The main task in the cultural field was liquidation of illiteracy and gradual transition to compulsory elementary education. In its message to the Portuguese people of June 30, 1960, the Movement's Executive said the Angolan people and the Movement were not striving for the reform of the Portuguese empire, but for the complete abolition of the colonial system in Angola, for the right to self-government and the possibility of exercising this right.

Another big party was formed in the north of the country under the name of the Popular Union of North Angola in 1954. In 1958 it was renamed the Union of the Peoples of Angola. The Union, led by Roberto Alvaro Holden (Jose Gilmore), also demanded full independence. Its leaders have established close contact with the Congolese ABAKO Party and support Kasavubu's idea of restoring the ancient Congolese state by uniting North Angola, the Republic of Congo (Brazzaville) and Leopoldville Province (the Republic of Congo, Leopoldville).

In May 1961 the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola and the Union of the Peoples of Angola reached agreement on joint action against Portuguese colonial rule.

The African Independence Party of Guinea and Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC), formed in 1956, demanded immediate independence for these territories; release of all political prisoners; withdrawal of Portuguese troops; establishment of a democratic system which would give the indigenous population complete political freedom; non-alignment; prohibition of foreign bases, and adherence to the Bandung and U.N. principles.

At a conference in Dakar (Senegal) in July 1961, the PAIGC, the Movement for the Liberation of Portuguese Guinea and Cape Verde Islands, and the Liberation Move-

ment of Guinea and Cape Verde Islands set up the United Liberation Front.

The struggle for independence in Portuguese Guinea and Cape Verde Islands intensified tangibly in the summer of that year. The African Independence Party sent the U.N. General Assembly a memorandum saying that the people of Portuguese Guinea and Cape Verde Islands, long oppressed and exploited by the Portuguese colonialists, were rising under the leadership of the African Independence Party and were determined to put an end to foreign rule.

Let us now turn to Mozambique. The Makonde Union, which was set up at the end of 1960, was especially influential in the northern part of the country. The first nation-wide political party was the National Democratic Union of Mozambique, founded in October 1961. Its chairman was Adelino Gwambe and one of its leaders was Makonde Union leader Marcelino dos Santos (K. Maala). The Union demanded independence. In November 1961 it sent the Portuguese Government a memorandum demanding the withdrawal of Portuguese troops from Mozambique.

In addition to the National Democratic Union there is the African National Union. In the summer of 1962 they established a united front. The leaders of these two parties issued a joint declaration in June, saying they would wage an uncompromising struggle for their country's liberation.

The progressive political parties in the Portuguese colonies made every effort to set up a united front against the colonialists. In 1960 they established the African Revolutionary Front for the Independence of Portuguese Colonies, with all the leading political parties represented in it. In December of that year representatives of the political parties in all the Portuguese colonies met in London and worked out the following demands which were then presented to the Portuguese Government: recognition of the Portuguese colonies' right to self-determination, release of all political prisoners, restoration of civil liberties, and withdrawal of all Portuguese troops. The conference communiqué said the political parties of the Portuguese colonies were compelled to take direct action because the Afri-colonialists were stubbornly refusing to satisfy the Afri-

cans' just demands. "We are peaceful people," Viriato da Cruz, Secretary-General of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola, told correspondents, "but the obduracy of the Portuguese colonialists has driven us to despair."

In April 1961 representatives of the national organisations operating in the Portuguese colonies met for their first conference in Casablanca (Morocco) to discuss joint action against colonialism. They set up a consultative council under the chairmanship of Mario Pinto de Andrade, the president of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola, and a permanent secretariat. The conference decisions further strengthened the Africans' unity in their struggle for liberation from the Portuguese colonial yoke. No one now says that the Portuguese colonies are a zone of silence.

The Portuguese Government is making frantic efforts to suppress the growing liberation movement. In a speech made at the beginning of 1959, the governor-general of Angola said: "The neighbouring territories are going through troublous times.... We must take care not to allow the sparks of the flames kindled by others to reach us." This statement was soon followed by concrete terroristic acts against the African population.

In March 1959 the Luanda police carried out mass arrests among freedom fighters. Another wave of arrests swept the country in July. In Luanda alone the police locked up 150 people. Among those taken into custody was Agostinho Neto, the well-known African poet and leader of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola. A demonstration in protest against Neto's arrest, organised in his home village of Ikolu e Bengu on July 3, 1960, was ferociously attacked by an armed detachment called in from the capital by the local authorities. The soldiers opened fire on the unarmed peasants, killing thirty and wounding about 200 people. In June 1960 the colonial authorities arrested Mario Pinto de Andrade, the only African doctor of theology in the country and Chancellor of the Luanda Archbishöpacy, a man well known for his anti-colonialism.

The developments in the Congo in the latter half of 1960 led the Portuguese to rush reinforcements to Ango-

la and build modern aerodromes. Portugal is a member of NATO and hopes to preserve her rule in the colonies with the assistance of her allies.

In June 1960 the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola asked the Portuguese Government urgently to convoke a round-table conference with the participation of all Angolan parties and government representatives to discuss the question of abolishing the colonial regime and recognising her national sovereignty.

The Portuguese Government's refusal to settle this issue peacefully forced the Africans to intensify their independence struggle. The first popular outbursts against the colonialists occurred early in 1961.

In February a group of armed Africans made an attempt to free political prisoners in Luanda and capture its broadcasting station and police barracks. Regular fighting went on in the capital's streets all through the 4th and the 5th, and resulted in 94 Africans being killed and several hundred wounded. Another unsuccessful attempt to seize the São Paulo jail and free the political prisoners was made on February 15. Government troops opened a hurricane of machine-gun fire on the insurgents, killing—according to newspaper reports—100 Africans.

That spring, isolated uprisings against Portuguese rule developed into a general insurrection. The insurgents seized a vast area in the north of the country. The Portuguese Government rushed troop reinforcements to Angola. By the end of April it sent another 15,000 there. Infantry, armoured forces, planes and napalm bombs have all been used against the insurgents. The Portuguese colonialists hope that their inhuman methods of suppressing the rising will daunt the Africans. Here is how the London *Economist* describes Portuguese action: "The air force goes in first, to bomb and destroy any village suspected of harbouring rebels. Then the army follows to 'pacify' what is left. In Luanda the word 'prisoner' is never mentioned." According to newspaper reports, 30,000 Africans were killed in Angola in March-May 1961.

People in the northern parts of the country fled en masse to the Congo to escape the atrocities committed by the Portuguese. Tens of thousands of Africans found re-

fuge in the Congolese villages lying along the Matadi-Thysville railway line.

In that same spring the situation in Angola was discussed in the U.N. Security Council and at the Fifteenth General Assembly. The delegates of the Soviet Union and Afro-Asian countries stressed that Portugal's behaviour in Angola was utterly contrary to the principles of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the General Assembly in December 1960. "The United Nations Organisation," the Soviet Government said in a special statement on Angola on May 27, 1961, "must take effective measures to bridle the Portuguese colonialists. Such atrocities cannot be tolerated in our day." Under the pressure of world public opinion, the General Assembly condemned the Portuguese colonialists and called upon the Portuguese Government to undertake reforms to satisfy the demands of the African population of Angola. A special five-nation sub-committee was set up to study the situation in that country and report back to the United Nations.

The Portuguese Government ignored the U.N. decision and went ahead with its attempt to drown the insurrection in blood. Fighting in Angola continued.

Reports say that by the end of 1961 Portugal had increased her army in Angola to 60,000 men. The budget expenditure for its maintenance increased from £10,143,000 in 1960 to £20,881,000 in 1961, that is, more than doubled—and this sum does not include the emergency credits voted for the pursuit of war in Angola. An economically weak country like Portugal naturally cannot stand such a financial strain without assistance from abroad. What is more, she will find it increasingly difficult to preserve her rule in the colonies, for the flames of revolt are spreading to her other possessions—Guinea and Mozambique.

In spite of this, the Portuguese Government, relying on the support of its NATO allies and primarily the United States, refuses to abide by the U.N. decision on the granting of independence to the colonial countries. Employing the tanks, planes and artillery pieces they supply, Portuguese troops had killed 60,000 Africans by the end of 1961. But although it is better armed, the Portuguese army has failed to put down the revolt. The Angolan guerillas are

becoming more organised. Their detachments have merged to form the National Liberation Army which controls a large part of the north of the country.

The independence struggle waged by the peoples of the Portuguese colonies continued to gain momentum in 1963. Despite the colonialists' boastful claims back in 1961 that the "rebellion" in Angola had been quashed, the Angolans' struggle is becoming increasingly widespread and organised. An Angolan provisional emigre government was formed in the Leopoldville Congo in 1963 by Roberto Holden. The national liberation movement in Portuguese Guinea is spreading too. Amilcar Cabral, the General Secretary of the African Party for the Independence of Portuguese Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands, told a correspondent of the Soviet newspaper *Pravda* in September 1963 that the guerillas were in control of one-third of Portuguese Guinea's territory. Guerilla forces on the Cape Verde Islands are also stepping up their activities. Repressions will not save the Portuguese colonialists.

SOUTH AFRICA

The Union of South Africa (now Republic of South Africa) came into existence in 1910 following the merger of several British colonies. It was the first British dominion in Africa and one that accounted for more than half of the Europeans living there. In 1960, the population of South Africa totalled 15,700,000, of whom 3,000,000 were Europeans.

By the time South Africa was proclaimed a dominion, the European minority had seized all the key positions in the country's economic and political life and instituted a regime of racial discrimination. The Africans, employed as cheap labour by European industrialists and planters, lived in abject poverty and suffered from lack of culture and political rights.

Their position has deteriorated still more since the end of the war. Frightened by the rise of the national liberation movement, the European rulers have tightened the screws of the racial yoke. Apartheid, or racial segregation, has been made a state policy. Former Prime Minister Daniel Malan once said frankly that racial discrimina-

tion, which finds expression in segregation or discriminatory attitude to people, has been South Africa's traditional racial policy since 1652, when the Dutch landed in Capetown.

Apartheid is applied not only to the Africans but to Asians and to people of mixed birth who constitute a large part of the population.

The Africans are not allowed to acquire land outside reserves. The government has allotted only 13 per cent of the country's land to the Africans and this means one hectare per capita for about 70 per cent of them. Many (about one-third) have none. The colonialists need cheap labour and they have obtained it by depriving the peasant of the source of his subsistence—land. In industry, Africans are usually employed on unskilled jobs. Skilled work is the privilege of the white.

The Africans enjoy absolutely no political rights and take no part in the government of the country. They are given to understand at every step that they are not full-fledged citizens. While Europeans can move about the country at will, the Africans must have permits to do so. Without a special pass no African can leave the location (reserve), move to another province and even appear at night in the streets of the city where he is allowed to live. If he comes to town and finds a job, he must report to the police every month. He is barred from a European hospital, his children cannot study with white children, he is not allowed to enter "white" snack rooms, restaurants or cinemas. In short, racial discrimination makes itself felt in everything.

Here is how Alfred Hutchinson, the well-known South African writer, describes the monstrous system of racial discrimination in his *Road to Ghana*: "You forgot your pass at home—prison. You went to the corner-shop and left your pass in your jacket—prison. You couldn't say you'd fetch it: you had failed to produce it on demand. You went to the communal lavatories without it—prison. You failed to pay tax; your master forgot to sign your pass at the end of the month—prison. You lost your job and failed to get another in the prescribed time—prison—endorsement out of the urban area. Passes could be demanded anywhere and everywhere: in the house, train,

at station entrances, street corners. Passes could be demanded at any time: morning, noon, midnight."

The first South African political organisation to fight for better living and working conditions for the Africans and for the extension of their political rights was the African National Congress (ANC), founded in 1912. The Communist Party of South Africa came into existence in 1921 but the adoption of the Suppression of Communism Act in 1950 forced it underground.

After the Second World War the ANC and the South African Indian Congress came out resolutely against the apartheid policy followed by the Malan Government (1948-54). In January 1952 the two parties demanded the annulment of discriminatory laws and warned that they would launch a disobedience campaign if it were not done.

The campaign was launched in April on a nation-wide scale. The Africans demonstratively entered "white" stores, cinemas and other places, remained in the streets after the appointed hour, and publicly burned their passes. The authorities retaliated with mass arrests, locking up more than 8,500 people within a few months.

In 1954 the South African Government promulgated the so-called Racial Groups Act to check the national liberation movement. This law was given effect in the following year, when the authorities began to move Africans and, to a certain extent, Indians from Johannesburg, one of the biggest cities in the country, and other big towns.

The regime of racial oppression was intensified by the government of Prime Minister Johannes Strydom (1954-58), who considered his predecessor's policy too "liberal".

On June 26, 1955, the ANC and the South African Indian Congress convoked the Congress of the People at Cliquetown, not far from Johannesburg. It was attended by representatives of various progressive organisations and was held to formulate the demands and wishes of the overwhelming majority of the country's population.

Despite the provocations of police agents, who had broken into the conference hall, the Congress unanimously adopted the Freedom Charter, a document of historic moment which outlined the programme the progressive forces were to follow in their struggle for the democratisation of South Africa's political system. The Charter de-

manded economic, political and social equality for all the inhabitants irrespective of their race, colour of skin and religion; universal franchise and the right for every adult, man and woman, to elect and to be elected to legislative bodies; cancellation of all discriminatory laws; usual bourgeois democratic freedoms (freedom of speech, assembly and the press); transfer of land to the tillers; return of the country's national wealth to the people; abolition of forced labour, and introduction of a forty-hour working week and progressive social legislation.

The Freedom Charter has from the start been an important programmatic document for all the progressive organisations opposing the racialist and fascist regime of South Africa.

Alarmed by the rapid spread of the national liberation movement, Strydom's Government drew up a plan for dealing with the most progressive political leaders. It set out to implement it on December 5, 1956, by arresting many people.

The campaign was preceded by sensational press reports about the discovery of a "Communist plot". One hundred and fifty-six people were charged with high treason, "Communist activity" and instigating revolt. It was clear that the government had decided to make short shrift of the national liberation movement leaders and used the "Communist plot" as a pretext. Actually, however, most of the men taken into custody were far removed from communist ideology. Only one thing united them—their hatred of the racialist regime. Among those jailed were ANC and South African Indian Congress leaders, prominent politicians and trade unionists, scholars and writers.

The trial was timed to take place when the international situation was seriously aggravated by the Suez crisis and the counter-revolutionary putsch in Hungary. The South African ruling clique thus tried to use the anti-communist hysteria as a cover for its vile persecution of the progressive forces.

The provocation suffered complete fiasco. The government failed to intimidate the accused and they turned the trial, which opened in December 1956, into a trial of the racialist regime. The accused became the accusers.

The evidence given by the defendants and the witnesses

tore the legally unsubstantiated indictment into shreds. At meetings and demonstrations, the masses openly expressed sympathy with the accused. The frame-up evoked world-wide protests. In the end, the South African Government was compelled to admit defeat. Sixty-five accused were acquitted in December 1957. The charges against another 61 were dropped in January 1959. The remaining 28 were cleared of all charges on March 29, 1961. One accused had died in the meantime and another had escaped. The "trial", accompanied by anti-communist hysteria, failed ignominiously.

The Verwoerd Government, which came to power in 1958, continues with the racialist policy of its predecessors. It has submitted to parliament a bill which provides for the resettlement of 10,000,000 Africans in the so-called Bantustans, a territory constituting one-eighth of South Africa. The Bantustan Law has deprived the Africans even of that ephemeral representation they enjoyed in parliament (in the past there were a few European M.P.s officially charged with protecting the interests of the indigenous population). In this truncated African "fatherland", the white racialists plan to restore the antiquated tribal order and put their own placemen—tribal chiefs—in power. The law on Bantustan, or rather Bantustans, for it is intended to establish several of them, is meant to solve the racial problem and put an end to the Africans' demand for broader political rights. But however much they try, the South African racialists will not delude anyone. The indigenous population is entitled not only to one-eighth of the country, but to the whole of it. No subterfuge can justify attempts to deprive the Africans of the right to the land where they and their ancestors were born and lived. In a message to the U.N. in the autumn of 1959 the African National Congress said it was opposed to the creation of national fatherlands in any arbitrarily limited territories. The Africans are autochthons (original inhabitants) and have an indisputable right to the whole of South Africa.

The South African national liberation movement is gaining in scope in spite of reprisals and bloody terror. The membership of the African National Congress increased from 7,000 in 1951 to 100,000 ten years later. The

Africans' struggle has the sympathy and support of progressive people everywhere. The racialist regime has time and again been condemned in the United Nations. There has not been a single African or Afro-Asian conference which has not stigmatised the South African Government's apartheid policy. The new African states regard the struggle against the racialist yoke as one of the main tasks confronting all the African peoples. Many African countries boycotted South African goods in 1959-62. In the spring of 1961 South Africa was compelled to withdraw from the British Commonwealth at the insistence of its Afro-Asian members. In South Africa herself, the struggle against the racialist regime is constantly spreading.

Despite scathing world-wide condemnation of apartheid, the ruling element in South Africa go on with their man-hating policy of racial segregation, regarding it as the only means capable of preserving the rule of the insignificant European minority. They resort to the bloodiest of terror to halt the liberation movement. On March 21, 1960, the racialists perpetrated another crime in Sharpeville by opening fire on 20,000 unarmed demonstrators protesting against the racialist laws. When the smoke cleared, there were 67 lying dead and 180 wounded. In June police were rushed in helicopters and lorries to Pondoland (one of the big reserves), where they surrounded an African meeting and opened fire on the unarmed people, killing eleven and seriously wounding many others. These massacres have failed to suppress the Africans' struggle for their rights and democratic freedoms. The fight against the colonialists went on in Pondoland all through the latter half of 1960, with the Africans setting fire to the homes of the hated chiefs and other placemen of the South African Government. The flames of revolt spread also to the Zululand and Tembuland reservations.

The indigenous population of South Africa is waging its struggle for democratic freedoms despite racialist terror. There were 66 trials in South Africa in 1963, and 36 persons were sentenced to death and hundreds to long-term imprisonment. Among those tried were Walter Sisulu, Nelson Mandela and other leaders of the outlawed African National Congress. In October 1963 the 18th General Assembly adopted yet another resolution condemning

South Africa's apartheid policy. The resolution demands an end to repressions and persecution of freedom fighters and release of political prisoners. The South African racialists, who are closely bound with British and American imperialists and are sure of their support, ignore U.N. resolutions and world public opinion. But they are underestimating the strength of the revolutionary masses.

A few words about the situation in Southwest Africa, which was unlawfully annexed by South Africa in 1951. Prior to the First World War Southwest Africa was a German colony. Like other German colonies, it became a League of Nations mandated territory and was placed under South African administration. After the Second World War all the mandated territories became U.N. trust territories. The former mandatories became trustees. The South African Government, however, has proclaimed Southwest Africa a constituent part of South Africa and refuses to recognise the United Nations' right to intervene in the affairs of this territory.

The repeated discussion of the Southwest African issue in the U.N. has not altered the situation in this country. In March 1961 the U.N. Trusteeship Council returned to this question and decided that the situation in Southwest Africa endangered international peace and security. The Council's resolution recognised the Southwest African population's aspiration to national independence. The Soviet delegation proposed to annul the South African mandate and to turn the administration of Southwest Africa to a special commission consisting of representatives of independent African states. This commission, the Soviet proposal said, would set up local organs of power so as to enable Southwest Africa to become an independent state in 1962.

Today, when the peoples of the African Continent are fighting for freedom and independence, South African problems transcend the bounds of this state and become international problems. The existence of an imperialist, racialist state in South Africa imperils the African states which have embarked on the path of democratic development. Consequently, the struggle against the racialist regime in South Africa is part and parcel of the worldwide struggle against imperialism and colonialism, for national liberation.

Chapter VI TOWARDS REGENERATION

The colonialists' political rule in Africa is coming to an end. The time is not far off when all the countries of this continent will be independent and sovereign. The achievement of political independence is an important, though only the first, step towards the elimination of their centuries-old backwardness. It offers the African countries wide opportunities for developing their economy, improving the material welfare of their peoples and raising their cultural level. The new African states need the assistance of the more developed countries to avail themselves of these opportunities. It would be only just if the imperialist powers, which had for tens and hundreds of years plundered the colonies' riches and exploited their peoples, returned a part of the booty to them. But one can hardly expect the imperialist powers to render anyone disinterested aid. That would be contrary to the very nature of capitalism. The imperialists agree to "help" only when they are sure of getting some returns. The newly-independent African states' urge to free themselves from foreign control and acquire genuine independence alarms the ruling elements in the imperialist countries. The former metropolitan powers are doing everything to preserve their privileges in Africa while the United States, which never had any colonies there, is going all out to expand and strengthen its economic, political and strategic positions on this continent.

U.S. expansion in Africa has intensified sharply since the end of the Second World War and especially in the past few years. In its report in 1956, the Special Study Mission to Africa led by Frances P. Bolton thus outlined the aims of U.S. policy: "The United States has certain general goals in Africa, namely, an interest in the evolu-

tion of Africa in a manner not inimical to our democratic type of government; the exclusion of influences unfriendly to our way of life; the hope of having access to the raw materials of that continent, especially to safeguard our minimum strategic needs."

In their public statements, American politicians try to persuade public opinion that the U.S. Administration sympathises with the African peoples' struggle for independence. But no manoeuvres or propaganda tricks can conceal the fact that the United States is now the main bulwark of colonialism. What price, for instance, the U.S. representatives' vote for the resolution demanding that Portugal cease repressing Africans in Angola when it has definitely been established that the U.S. Government is supplying the arms and other war material with which she does it? Could economically weak Portugal keep her colonies without the assistance of the United States and her other NATO allies? Could France have waged a colonial war in Algeria without the support of her allies in NATO? The world knows the role the United States played in the Algerian war.

Instead of helping the African peoples in their independence fight, the United States is the colonialists' partner-in-crime in Algeria, Tunisia, the Congo and other countries. The entire system of U.S. directed aggressive military blocs—NATO, CENTO and SEATO—has been put at the service of colonialism.

By supporting the policy of other imperialist powers the United States seeks to consolidate its own position in the colonies. In the fifteen post-war years, according to official figures, American monopolies have pumped \$1,234 million out of Africa. The United States hopes to enhance its influence there still more through "aid" to the economically weak states.

The imperialist powers are doing everything possible to preserve and strengthen their economic position in Africa.

Their investments in the African countries—private and state—have increased enormously. American investments in 1959, for instance, exceeded \$2,000 million and were twenty times the pre-war amount. In 1952 the U.S. monopolies controlled 22.8 per cent of Africa's oil output, 40.3 per cent of manganese ore, 46.8 per cent of vanadium, 34.5

per cent of lead, 15.3 per cent of zinc, 96.2 per cent of cadmium and 59.8 per cent of bauxites.

The agreement the United States signed with Britain and Belgium in 1955 gave it 90 per cent of Congolese uranium and thorium. The United States accounts for 50 per cent of the capital invested in Northern Rhodesia's copper ore industry; the rest belongs to British and South African interests. Rubber output in Liberia is almost entirely controlled by Firestone. The Americans have investments also in South Africa and other African countries.

West German capital is penetrating into Africa on an increasing scale. Federal Germany's monopolies take part in the exploitation of oil in the Sahara, in mining bauxites in Guinea and the Congo, iron ores in Mauritania, etc., and are especially active in the former German colonies of Tanganyika, the Cameroons and Togo. Federal Germany's trade with the African countries grows from year to year.

Most of African states are financially dependent on the former metropolitan countries and are part of the pound sterling, French franc or Belgian franc zone. In Ghana, the banks, gold and diamond mines and most of the trade are still in the hands of the British monopolies. Approximately 90 per cent of capital investments in Tunisia and Morocco are of foreign origin. French capital has retained its position in almost all the other former French colonies. The imperialist powers make use of all sorts of "aid" to strengthen their hold on Africa. In recent years the developing Afro-Asian countries have had ample opportunity to convince themselves of the vast difference between the disinterested assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to the new states in consolidating their economic independence and the "aid" granted by the capitalist countries. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries co-operate economically with the African states in the sincere desire to help them build up a national economy, liquidate illiteracy and raise the people's living and cultural standards. The Soviet Union is assisting African, Asian and Latin-American countries in the construction of about 480 enterprises, including power stations, iron and steel works, chemical and engineering plants, mines, oil refineries, and food-processing plants.

The Soviet Union has concluded agreements on economic and technical co-operation with many African countries. They provide for Soviet technical assistance in the building of more than 250 industrial and other installations. The biggest are the Aswan Dam and the power station on the Nile which will supply Egypt with cheap electric energy and irrigate vast tracts of land formerly considered unfillable. In Ghana, plans provide for the construction of about forty industrial and other enterprises with Soviet technical assistance; in Guinea—more than seventy. A broadcasting station in Conakry and a 300-ton cold storage have already been built and an aerodrome rebuilt in Guinea. The construction of a polytechnical institute is nearing completion. In Ethiopia, the Soviet Union is helping build an oil refinery with an annual capacity of 500,000 tons.

Soviet specialists are helping African countries explore for minerals. The U.S.S.R. grants them long-term credits on easy terms and this enables them to expand trade and build various enterprises. Thousands of young African men and women study in Soviet higher educational establishments.

There are no political strings attached to Soviet assistance and therein lies its fundamental difference from the "aid" given the African countries by the capitalist states. Soviet credits are granted with a view to developing their national economy and raising living standards. They do not in any way impinge upon the sovereignty of the recipients. American loans, on the other hand, are advanced primarily for military aims—construction of motor roads, bases and other military installations—and on terms which are tantamount to interference in the affairs of the "aided" countries.

Unlike Soviet assistance, capitalist "aid" is not given to help recipient countries build up an independent economy but to facilitate the exploitation of their natural wealth and peoples by the monopolies. It has been made a tool of new colonial policy and stunts the growth of the national economy of the less developed countries and subordinates it to foreign capital.

The independence of the African countries is particularly imperilled by the numerous U.S., British, French,

Belgian and Portuguese bases on the continent. They are as a rule retained even after these countries have achieved independence. The United States maintains naval and air bases in Morocco, Libya and Liberia; Britain in East Africa (Kenya and Tanganyika) and Sierra Leone; France in Tunisia, Algeria, Senegal, the Malagasy Republic and French Somaliland; Portugal in Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea.

Imperialist propaganda alleges that these bases are indispensable on account of "communist menace". But there are fewer and fewer people who believe this fable. The Africans know that there can be no genuine independence so long as foreign troops remain on their territory. This was convincingly proved by the July 1961 developments in Tunisia. When the Tunisian Government demanded the withdrawal of French troops from Bizerta, the Paris Government resorted to arms. Hundreds of people were killed and wounded in the streets of Bizerta. The blood shed by the French stressed once again the serious danger presented by foreign military bases, and it is not at all surprising that the struggle for their abolition has assumed such wide proportions.

Economic and military means of pressure are not the only ones which the imperialists use to tie the new African states to their chariot. They put their placemen in power, try to impose their ideology and the Western way of life on the African leaders, and frighten them with the bogey of communism.

The ideologists of present-day colonialism do not risk openly challenging the Africans' right to independence. What they do is advance the fallacious thesis that some African countries are not ready for self-government and that premature independence is fraught with great danger for the Africans themselves. Characteristically enough, the countries proclaimed the least prepared for independence are usually those where the European population is largest and where, consequently, the conditions should be most favourable for the colonialists' "civilising mission". The British Government, for instance, has agreed to grant independence to Tanganyika and Uganda, but stubbornly refuses to grant it to Northern and Southern Rhodesia. The British imperialists' policy is wholly determined

by the interests of the monopolies and European settlers.

The plans for the establishment of the so-called Euro-African Community are also dictated by the desire of the imperialist powers to draw the African countries into their sphere of influence. These plans are being implemented with the aid of such organisations as the European Economic Community and Euratom. Early in 1959 the French Big Business mouthpiece *Usine nouvelle* wrote: "The penetration of Standard Oil into the Sahara and the welcome inflow of German capital, which is expected to start in the near future, to say nothing of financial and technical assistance, will benefit France mainly because they help strengthen her influence in the Sahara and, consequently, in Algeria, and bind our partners to help us defend our positions." This candid statement shows that the colonial powers which are incapable of preserving their rule in Africa rely on the support of the world capitalist system. Therein lies the policy of "collective colonialism".

And so, thrown out of the colonies through the front door, imperialism is trying to get in again through the back door, using all sorts of economic, political and military means.

The Third All-African Peoples' Conference in March 1961 concentrated its attention mainly on the struggle against new forms of colonialism. The decisions adopted by the conference stressed that neo-colonialism, whose leading proponents are the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, Britain, Belgium, Holland, France and South Africa, was the biggest threat to the new African states.

The Africans have learned to anticipate the colonialists' manoeuvres and try to avoid being caught in the mesh of slavery and acquire genuine, and not formal, independence. The Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Cairo noted that the imperialist powers' attempt to dragoon the African countries into the Common Market aimed at turning their economy into the property of the Six.

Addressing African freedom fighters at the beginning of June 1962, Kwame Nkrumah said: "The Common Market aims at using the African countries in its own in-

terest, to satisfy the imperialist bloc's lust for profit and prevent us from pursuing our neutral policy. If we do not resist this danger and cast our lot with the Common Market, we shall for ever subordinate Africa's economy to that of Western Europe."

The main goal before the African states is to overcome economic backwardness and eliminate the aftermaths of colonialism. The achievement of this aim could be facilitated by closer economic and political co-operation among the independent African countries. The resolution on frontiers and federation, adopted by the First All-African Peoples' Conference in 1958, said Africa's unity was indispensable for the independence and welfare of the African peoples. The conference recommended the establishment of the Union of African States. This was also discussed at the Second and Third All-African Peoples' Conferences. The Cairo Conference of 1961 decided to set up a consultative assembly composed of parliamentarians from independent states and the Council of African States which would advise the Consultative Assembly on diverse issues. It was also decided to organise a number of general committees which would co-ordinate economic development and defence plans and elaborate joint measures for raising the people's cultural level and establishing joint educational institutions.

The implementation of this big programme of political and economic unity is meeting with serious difficulties. Not all the countries have yet freed themselves from the colonialists and therefore cannot join the union or federation of independent states. In some of the countries which have already broken out of colonial bondage the Union of African States plan evokes distrust, engendered by fear that it will mean the loss of newly-won national sovereignty. Moreover, the Union is opposed everywhere by the feudal and reactionary forces, who preach separatism. Many of the countries which have smashed the colonial chains continue to "co-operate" closely with the imperialist powers. The former French colonies which have formed the African Malagasy Union intend to co-operate with the European Economic Community. There can only be one result of such "co-operation" between the rider and the horse: perpetuation of these countries' status as agrar-

ian and raw-material appendages of the industrially developed European countries.

Despite numerous difficulties, the Union of African States idea is slowly but surely gaining recognition. The first step towards its realisation was made by Ghana and Guinea on November 28, 1958, when they issued a joint declaration on their union. The declaration pointed out that the union of the two countries was destined to be the basis for broader union among the independent West African states. Here is what Dr. Nkrumah told the First All-African Peoples' Conference: "My government and the Government of Guinea were inspired by the desire to take steps which, we hope, will create the nucleus of a West African union that will be joined by other independent states as well as those which will soon come into existence."

In January 1961 Ghana, Guinea and Mali signed an agreement on the introduction of a single currency and the establishment of a single bank for the three countries. This agreement paves the way to closer co-operation among progressive African states.

The Casablanca conference of 1961, attended by representatives of Ghana, Guinea, Mali, the United Arab Republic, Morocco and Algeria, did much to enhance African unity. It decided to establish several all-African bodies, including a supreme command consisting of the chiefs of general staff of the independent states.

The imperialist powers seek to prevent the formation of a united anti-imperialist front in Africa. It was not without their influence that certain African states met in Monrovia (Liberia) in May 1961 to discuss the same issue of African unity. But unlike the Casablanca conference, the Monrovia conference displayed an inclination to preserve close ties with the imperialist powers. Its decisions by-passed such important issues as the final abolition of colonialism throughout the continent, cancellation of shackling agreements with imperialist powers, and closure of foreign military bases.

The participants in the Casablanca conference did not attend the conference in Monrovia, and this led to observers dividing the African states into two groups—the Casablanca and the Monrovia. However, it would be premature

to effect such differentiation, for many African states have not yet defined their policy clearly enough.

But, as we have said above, the Union of African States idea is hewing itself a path despite all difficulties.

An important landmark on this path was the Addis Ababa conference in 1963.

The 31 independent African states which took part in it agreed to set up the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), which has been joined by all the African countries with the exception of the Republic of South Africa. The aim of the OAU is to promote co-operation among African states, defend their sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence, strive for the abolition of all forms of colonialism on the continent, and promote international co-operation.

The conference set up the following OAU bodies: the Assembly of the Heads of State and Government, the Council of Foreign Ministers, the General Secretariat, and the Conciliation Commission, which is to mediate and arbitrate in the disputes that may arise between African states.

Among the important documents adopted by the Addis Ababa conference were the Charter of the Organisation of African Unity and resolutions on decolonisation, apartheid, general disarmament, and inter-African economic co-operation. With the object of consolidating unity the conference called for dissolving all blocs and regional alliances of African states. Economic and political ties among African countries can be effective only if they accord with the interests of the African peoples.

A big role in consolidating African unity is played by the working class. The first All-African Trade Union Congress was held in Casablanca in May 1961 and was attended by representatives of forty unions from 38 countries. They discussed two reports: "The Development of the African Trade Union Movement and the Role of the Working Class in the Struggle Against Colonialism, for Independence, Democracy and Unity" and "Joint Programme of Action and Trade Union Unity on National and All-African Scale on the Issues of War in Algeria, Colonialism and Neo-Colonialism, Racial Discrimination and Atomic Tests in the Sahara". In its decisions, the congress stressed that the unions cannot keep aloof from the Af-

rican people's great battle against colonialism and imperialism, that they must become an active force in the struggle for political power and strive for the consolidation of economic independence in the countries which have achieved political freedom.

The congress adopted an important resolution on the establishment of the All-African Trade Union Federation. It also decided that its members could not be affiliated to other international federations. The representatives of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and the AFL-CIO exerted every effort to prevent the formation of an all-African federation and went so far as to offer bribes to some delegates. Denouncing the backstage manoeuvres of the enemies of African unity, the well-known trade union leader Seidou Diallo wrathfully said: "Now I know who familiarly patted us on the back, who tried to win us over and buy us by handing out dollars between the sessions."

The establishment of the All-African Trade Union Federation is a big victory in the African struggle for working-class unity of action against colonialism and for genuine economic and political independence. This is what alarms the colonialists and they seek to split the trade union movement. Another trade union conference was convoked in Dakar in January 1962 and it set up a trade union centre in opposition to the All-African Trade Union Federation. This centre is called the Confederation of African Trade Unions and has its headquarters in Dakar. Its members retain the right to be affiliated to other international federations. The formation of the second trade union centre was the result of the splitting activity of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which did not scruple any means to preserve its influence in the African unions. The division of the African trade union movement weakens the influence exerted by the working class on the solution of problems connected with Africa's development. That is why the consolidation of the trade union movement is one of the most important tasks facing Africa's young working class. The secretariats of the All-African Trade Union Federation and the Confederation of African Trade Unions held a conference in October 1963 and agreed to establish a single African

trade union centre which would be independent of any international federation. A special committee has been set up to make arrangements for the establishment of this single centre.

Political independence in itself does not mean complete national liberation. It will not endure unless economic independence is achieved and an end put to foreign monopoly domination in the economy. This was stressed with particular force in the decisions of the Second Afro-Asian Peoples' Conference in Conakry in 1960. "The Conference reaffirms," says one of the resolutions, "that the Afro-Asian peoples cannot consider their struggle for independence over until they have eliminated economic inequality and built a sound and independent economy. Political independence alone does not offer the Afro-Asian countries the possibility of dealing successfully with the imperialists' intrigues. Achievement of economic independence provides solid protection from economic blackmail and pressure, and supplements and strengthens our political sovereignty.... Our Conference therefore declares that the struggle for complete economic independence is now the cardinal task before the Afro-Asian countries which have won political independence."

How can this complex task be solved? What path should one take? There are two socio-economic systems in the world: socialist and capitalist. Which of them is the more capable of facilitating the enormous task of eliminating the African countries' backwardness in the briefest possible time? Life itself poses these questions to the political parties which guide the policy of the new African states.

Progressive-minded politicians know very well that African countries can surmount their economic backwardness quickly if they make themselves independent of the former metropolises. The only way to build a solid, independent economy is to uproot imperialist economic domination, restrict and oust the foreign monopolies, create and develop the state sector in industry, and carry out an agrarian reform. The developing countries can best eliminate their age-old backwardness by taking the non-capitalist path of development. The C.P.S.U. Programme says: "Socialism is the road to freedom and happiness for the peoples. It ensures rapid economic and cultural

progress. It transforms a backward country into an industrial country within the lifetime of one generation and not in the course of centuries."

It is for the peoples themselves to decide which road they will take. In view of the present balance of world forces and the possibility of obtaining powerful support from the world socialist system, the peoples of the former colonies can decide this question in their own interest. This truth is becoming clear to many African leaders. Addressing a Soviet-Guinean friendship rally in Conakry on February 12, 1961, President Sékou Touré said: "We have chosen between the forces of exploitation and oppression, that is, imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, and the socialist forces. We are not afraid of this choice..., which means a merciless struggle against all phenomena bound with imperialism and colonialism, a struggle for the most popular form of democratisation of our society and for the establishment of an order based exclusively on the over-all interests of the Guinean and other peoples of the world."

Dr. Nkrumah, the leader of the People's Party and President of Ghana, also favours the non-capitalist path of development. In a speech made in Accra on February 17, 1961, he said: "As for our home policy, the Convention People's Party and the Government of Ghana are determined to build a socialist society adapted to the specific conditions of Africa." In July 1962 the party's Eleventh Congress adopted a programme saying scientific socialism was the basis of its ideological activity.

The Algerian Constitution says that the main aims of the republic are establishment of socialist democracy and abolition of all forms of exploitation.

"There is no force in the world," President Ben Bella said in the autumn of 1963, "which could divert us from the path of socialist development."

Progressive African politicians regard the U.S.S.R. as a model to be emulated. During his visit to the Soviet Union, President Modibo Keita of Mali said: "You and we believe in the victory of socialism. That is why we wanted to come to the source of the idea to see for ourselves your country's life and your successes, even though the living conditions in your country somewhat differ from those in

ours. Nevertheless, we want to borrow from your experience inasmuch as the main thing is the aim before us, the aim which you have already achieved, the results which you seek to develop and improve."

The Sixth Congress of the Sudanese Union, held in September 1962, drew up a programme for socialist construction in the near future.

All this testifies to the fact that the most progressive African politicians prefer the non-capitalist path of development for their continent.

It should be pointed out, however, that different African leaders interpret socialism in different ways. Some theoreticians and political leaders, who advocate so-called "African socialism", allege that Marxism-Leninism is unacceptable to Africa, that socialist construction can be reconciled with the private ownership of the means and instruments of production. Such views show that they harbour petty-bourgeois illusions about the possibility of building socialism without a resolute struggle against imperialism and domestic reaction, without a class struggle, and consequently serve as an ideological weapon of neo-colonialism.

The non-capitalist path of development is not only possible for the African countries, it is indispensable for their economic growth. We have already noted that what distinguishes the economic development of African countries is the fact that capitalist relationships were introduced there from without. Foreign capital hampered the growth of the national bourgeoisie and there was practically no national industrial bourgeoisie in the countries of Tropical Africa when they achieved independence.

The metropolitan countries encouraged the cultivation of export crops and that explains why the African bourgeoisie thrived mainly in agriculture. The urban petty bourgeoisie consists of owners of small industrial and trading establishments and handicraft-type workshops.

Foreign trade was also monopolised by foreign firms. The middlemen between the producers of export crops and the foreign monopolies were mostly Asians (Indians and Lebanese) and not Africans. Hence the weakness of the national bourgeoisie, which has not the necessary funds to ensure the rapid growth of national private industry.

True, the governments of some of the states which have embarked upon the capitalist path of development have taken steps to strengthen the private capital sector. At the end of 1960, soon after the proclamation of independence, the Federal Government of Nigeria concluded agreements with the British Petroleum and Shell companies for the construction of an oil refinery at Port Harcourt. When it is completed in 1964, its capacity will be 1,000,000 tons of oil a year. Nigeria has also signed agreements with private firms for the construction of a cement works at Evecor and a textile mill at Ikeja. This economic policy inevitably leads to greater African dependence on foreign capital.

The most progressive way of ensuring rapid economic development and putting an end to the African countries' dependence on the imperialist powers lies in the construction of state enterprises. At the same time, the establishment of a state sector in industry can create favourable conditions for non-capitalist development.

In agriculture, as in industry, the socialist path of development offers the best possible opportunities for increasing output. In a number of African countries (Tunisia, Morocco, Southern Rhodesia, and Kenya among them) there are large capitalist plantations. A considerable segment of African peasants, engaged in growing crops for export and home consumption, belong to the small-commodity sector. In some countries (Tunisia, Morocco, Uganda, Nigeria and others) one meets with feudal forms of exploitation. On the whole, however, the influence of feudal elements in Tropical Africa is not too great. The bulk of the population are peasants engaged in natural economy. The communal form of landownership predominates and this will play an important role in the solution of the agricultural problem. The capitalist path would call for the introduction of private landownership and rural differentiation—enrichment of the rich minority and ruin for the poor majority. That is what usually happened in agriculture in the past. Today, when there exists a world socialist system, there is yet another way—a way which offers wide possibilities for rapidly increasing agricultural production. The absence of private landownership on much of Africa's territory facilitates

the establishment of state and collective farms well armed with modern agricultural tools.

In countries where feudal ownership and feudal forms of exploitation still prevail, the paramount task is to carry out an agrarian reform which would abolish large estates and give land to land-hungry and landless peasants. Such a reform was carried out, though not consecutively, in Egypt in 1952-61. Prior to the reform, 94 per cent of landowners accounted for 35 per cent of tillable land and 19 per cent of it was in the hands of 0.08 per cent of the rich landowners. As a result of the 1952 reform, the estates of the big landowners were confiscated and distributed among the landless. The maximum size of estates was limited to 200 feddans (feddan—0.415 hectare). In 1961 the government went a step further and set the limit at 100 feddans.

One very important stage on the path of non-capitalist development could be the establishment of national democratic states, that is, states resolutely upholding their political and economic independence and opposing imperialism and its military blocs, military bases on their territory, new forms of colonialism and penetration of imperialist capital; states in which the people are ensured broad democratic rights, take part in shaping state policy, and are given an opportunity to implement agrarian and other social reforms in their own interest. This path will enable the new states to deliver themselves from foreign tutelage and enhance the material and cultural level of their peoples. The political foundation of a national democratic state is the bloc of all progressive, patriotic forces fighting to win complete national independence and broad democracy, and to consummate the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, democratic revolution.

The new African states are confronted with big and complex problems. Their correct solution will make it easier to eradicate the pernicious heritage of the colonial past. Successes scored by some will inspire others. That explains the significance of the socio-economic transformations undertaken in Guinea, Ghana and Mali.

Guinea's withdrawal from the French Community initially entailed certain economic difficulties but at the same time it helped her build an independent economy.

One of the first steps the Guinean Government took was to establish control over foreign trade. All export and import operations (signing of trade treaties, issue of licences and control over the activities of private firms) were handed over to state bodies.

The Guinean Government set out to liquidate the large network of small and big middlemen in trade. It established the Home Trade Board, which sees to it that trading enterprises are kept supplied with goods, looks after the sale of imported goods and controls private retail and wholesale trade. In March 1960 the government carried out a currency reform and set up a national bank—the Bank of the Republic of Guinea. Guinea withdrew from the French franc zone and introduced a national currency—the Guinean franc. This step plays an important part in laying a solid foundation for economic independence.

On July 1, 1960, Guinea launched her first three-year plan. In the sphere of agriculture, it provided for the introduction of new farming methods and the establishment of 500 co-operatives of different types. The ones of the lowest type envisage only collective use of agricultural implements and those of the highest type—the pooling of land and means of production.

The plan also provided for the establishment of a state sector in agriculture.

In the sphere of national industrial development, it envisaged, first, the establishment of small enterprises to process agricultural products. It was planned to build thirty state manufactories.

At its conference in November 1960, the Democratic Party of Guinea decided to buy out foreign industrial enterprises and nationalise them. This has already been done with diamond mines, waterworks and a number of power stations owned by French companies. The nationalisation of industry will help consolidate Guinea's economic independence.

The position of the Guinean working people has improved considerably. The network of elementary and secondary schools is being expanded and medical services are being improved. The Soviet Union is helping Guinea build her first higher educational establishment—the Polytechnical Institute.

These successes on the road to economic and social regeneration have been made possible by the labour enthusiasm inspired in people by their liberation from the colonial yoke and the construction of their own, free state.

Ghana has also achieved much success in consolidating her independence. After winning freedom, the Government of Ghana took steps to establish control over foreign trade. Until recently, cocoa beans were bought up by private firms. In 1961 the government turned over their sales to a state-controlled farmer council. In the past all cocoa transactions were effected in London. Now an international cocoa market has been set up in Accra and the prices will be fixed in Ghana and not in the British capital. Until 1960, 40 per cent of the shares in the shipping company servicing Ghana's foreign trade belonged to foreigners. In 1960 the Ghanaian Government bought these shares and turned the company into a state enterprise. The same has been done with the airline, where 40 per cent of the shares were until 1960 owned by the British too.

Timber exports, the second biggest item of Ghana's income, were until 1960 fully controlled by foreign companies. In 1960 the Ghanaian Government set up the Timber Sales Board which now controls the bulk of exports.

The government has, moreover, launched on the development of the state sector in industry and the restriction of the private sector.

Ghana's five-year plan of economic development (1959-64) provides for the consolidation of the state economic sector. It is planned to build a number of hydro-power stations. The most important will be the 900,000-kw station on the Volta. The fulfilment of this plan will enable the country to mine its rich bauxite deposits and electrify the national economy, which is of particular significance for Ghana, a country poor in mineral fuel.

Ghana's Government intends to take control over the mining industry. It has already bought out and nationalised five British gold mining companies and one Dutch diamond syndicate, and has reorganised them into a state mining corporation.

In agriculture, the Ghanaian Government—like the Guinean—encourages co-operation. In a speech at the opening of the First All-African Peoples' Conference, Dr. Nkrumah said: "Communal landownership prevails in many rural areas of Africa and people there work on the basis of co-operation and mutual aid. Such are the main traits still dominating in African society and we can do nothing better than to adapt them to the requirements of the more modern socialist structure of society."

Living standards have improved tangibly since the proclamation of Ghana's independence: the wages of the low-paid categories of factory and office workers have been raised, housing construction expanded, and compulsory free education introduced (the latter in 1961).

The progressive path of development has been taken by Mali too. Speaking of the policy followed by the government and the ruling Sudanese Union, its Political Secretary, Idrissa Diarra, said in November 1960 that the Union favoured the implementation of a rational development plan under state direction and the effective socialisation of all spheres of national endeavour. The first five-year plan, adopted in 1961, provides for a 65 per cent increase in agricultural output and for the construction of a number of state enterprises. There will be a state monopoly on the mining industry and electric power output. The state sector will be developed in the spheres of finance, transport, and home and foreign trade. Along with the state sector, the plan envisages the development of the private sector under state control.

Immediately after the proclamation of independence in Algeria the Ben Bella Government set out to implement an agrarian reform. In the summer of 1962, following the mass flight of the European colonists, Algerian army units, acting together with farm labourers and land-poor peasants, began to form committees to look after the abandoned estates. It was then that the first co-operatives came into existence. In March 1963 the Algerian Government decreed the nationalisation of 1,000,000 hectares of land. Among the estates nationalised was that of Borgeaut, the big French landowner. Control over the confiscated land was handed over to the management committees. The gov-

ernment also nationalised about 500 industrial enterprises, which thus became public property.

On October 1, 1963, the Algerian Government issued another decree on the distribution among peasants of all other land formerly in European possession. Thanks to this, the Algerian peasants received about 3,000,000 hectares of fertile land by the end of the year. This land, making up 40 per cent of the total tillable area, now constitutes the socialist sector in Algerian agriculture.

The Algerian Government plans to complete the agrarian reform in the next few years and to confiscate the estates of big Arab landowners.

"We shall achieve our reform and will hand over between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 hectares of land to the peasants," President Ben Bella declared in November 1963. "We intend to do it within three or four years, step by step, so as to prevent a sharp decline in agricultural production."

Besides the agrarian reform, Ben Bella's Government has set itself the task of industrialising the country within the shortest possible span of time.

In building a new life, Algeria is being generously assisted by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The Soviet Union has granted her a long-term credit and is helping her in the construction of 60 industrial enterprises.

In present conditions, rapid economic, social and cultural progress is possible only along the socialist path. This is becoming clear to an increasing number of progressive African leaders.

But it would be a mistake to underestimate the forces of imperialism which spare no effort to preserve their economic position and political influence in Africa. Relying on a large network of agents, the imperialist powers are doing everything to push the African countries on to the capitalist path. The outcome of the struggle between progressive and reactionary forces will determine the development of the African nations. The experience of the socialist countries, which have made outstanding progress in a brief historical period, is an inspiring example and will help them choose the right path.

* * *

The collapse of colonialism in Africa further weakens world imperialism and strengthens the forces of peace, democracy and socialism.

Africa is no longer an object of world policy. Together with other countries, the African states take an active part in solving urgent international issues. The independent African countries refuse to join aggressive imperialist blocs, follow a policy of positive neutrality and favour effective disarmament and prohibition of nuclear weapons. Their voice in the United Nations grows more impressive with each passing year. This was convincingly proved at the Sixteenth General Assembly. Their draft resolution on turning Africa into a denuclearised zone, supported by the socialist countries, was passed by 55 votes with 44 abstentions. This resolution, which was not backed by the United States, Britain, Belgium, Portugal and certain other countries, deals a severe blow at those who would turn Africa into a nuclear proving ground.

Under the pressure of the Afro-Asian countries, the U.N. Security Council condemned the Tshombe government's separatist activity in Katanga and reaffirmed its determination to help the Congolese Central Government preserve the country's territorial integrity. At the Seventeenth General Assembly, which devoted much attention to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples, the young African states demanded the immediate abolition of colonialism, and independence for the remaining colonies. In short, the African countries, which in the none-too-remote past were the reserve and the rear of imperialism, have become an active and independent force in international affairs.

Preservation of peace and abolition of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations are indispensable if the African countries are to overcome their backwardness. Only if there is enduring universal peace can they create the necessary conditions to solve the grand task of catching up with the developed countries in the shortest possible time and thus improve the welfare of their peoples.

Africa is on its way to regeneration. The new African states face many complex problems in rebuilding their social and economic life. Soviet people sincerely wish the

peoples of this long-suffering continent success in their struggle against backwardness. In his greetings to the Fourth Session of the U.N. Economic Commission for Africa on February 18, 1962, Premier Khrushchov said: "The colonial system has been dealt crushing blows from which it will never recover. But the final destruction of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations and the eradication of its pernicious aftermaths will require no little joint effort by the African peoples and the peoples of the world. It is necessary first of all to achieve the immediate and full implementation of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples.

"The peoples of the Soviet Union have always sympathised with the peoples fighting for freedom and independence. The friendly relations and fraternal co-operation with the peoples who have smashed the colonial chains are one of the basic principles of the Soviet Union's foreign policy."

TO THE READER

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, U.S.S.R.